

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XV

SEPTEMBER, 1927

No. 87

EDITORIAL

It can be given to few men of our time to make such interesting journeys, or to describe them so attractively, as those to which Sir Henry Lunn introduces us in *Round the World with a Dictaphone*.* The sub-title is "A Record of Men and Movements in 1926"; and there are certainly few phases of life in the English-speaking world on which Sir Henry Lunn does not throw some light. Natural scenery, commerce, politics, religion, personal anecdote—all these figure in his story; and the result is a book at once instructive and entertaining, full of shrewdness, sympathy, and humour. Various as his interests are, there is no doubt, however, as to the two causes which most enlist his enthusiasm. They are Reunion and the League of Nations. His favourite subject for addresses is the question "Can Christendom save Civilization?"; and his answer is that it can if it is itself united, and through its unity succeeds in making the League of Nations a reality.

One of the merits of Sir Henry's book is that it provokes reflection on a number of the larger issues which at present confront the minds of Christian statesmen. Not the least of these is the present influence and future prospects of the Christian faith and Christian values in the United States of America. It is an absorbing problem, because one undeniable result of the Great War has been immensely to increase the material wealth and financial power of that Republic; and the use which America is likely to make of these opportunities is bound to affect the future of all other countries. If professions of idealism from press and pulpit could be taken as a guide, the prospect would indeed be bright; and we can well understand the irresistible attraction which it has for generous minds on this side of the Atlantic. Sir Henry Lunn is evidently one of these. Yet we cannot but think that he has missed some important aspects of the problem.

* Ernest Benn. 1927. 10s. 6d. net.

In our judgment, the most interesting issue presented by American religion arises not from its strength as expressed in numbers of Church adherents, but from the relatively small influence which this religion appears to exercise on the aims and trend of American policy as a whole. The result is a series of contradictions which stand out in sharp relief. When we contrast, for instance, the humanitarian professions of American Protestantism with a legal system which leaves two wretches waiting seven years for their death; when we reflect on her great refusal to shoulder the responsibilities of the League of Nations in the light of the lavish pronouncement of President Wilson in 1917 and 1918; above all, when we realize that the treatment of Nicaragua has caused little more than a ripple on the surface of American public opinion—then, indeed, it is difficult to deny that American idealism presents a problem. The real question of moment is as to the causes of this disparity between profession and practice. In this country it is not too much to say that an exploit like that of the American aeroplanes in Nicaragua would have shaken a British Government to its foundations. Why is it that in the United States Christian public opinion operates so differently?

One important cause of this is, no doubt, provided by geography: in a country so vast as the United States the effective mobilization of Christian opinion must present immense difficulties, and the result is an executive less sensitive to the spiritual forces of society than is the case in England. More potent, however, is the disordered state of these same spiritual forces themselves. For in America the inherent individualism of schism has been given full rein, and the most glaring breaches of the Christian moral tradition can take place under the cloak of religion. The vocation of the Episcopal Church lies in its steadfast witness to those Catholic traditions of faith and morals which are characteristic of Anglicanism. That is why its strength is out of all proportion to its numbers; and in that common tradition which American Churchmen share with us we see the most solid hope for understanding and co-operation between the two countries in the future.

AN EXPERIMENT IN THE PASTORAL WORK
OF THE LAITY.

MR. H. G. WELLS, in his *World of William Clissold*, predicts the death by inanition of an interesting series of institutions, including monarchy, Socialism, Parliamentary government, armies, navies, lifelong marriage, and Christianity. The whole list is full of interest, but it is with Christianity that we are concerned in this article. According to this stimulating, versatile, and changeful writer, Roman Catholicism will longest stave off death by reason of its highly organized and centralized discipline; but the end, while it may be delayed by a course of spiritual thyroid treatment, cannot be averted. This is very vivid and popular speculation, but well-wrought anvils are tough, and have a way of wearing out many hammers. Mr. Wells is not the first prophet to announce the approaching demise of the Christian Church. He belongs, indeed, to a school of prophets—the thought might distress his original mind—of which Voltaire was a distinguished member. Each in turn has ordered a wreath for the Church, and has delivered a funeral oration, but the patient makes a sound recovery every time.

A study of history throws much light on the causes of the ebb and flow of church life. Human society is not unlike a good side of bacon. Settlement and unrest alternate, like the layers of fat and lean. To take only recent illustrations: the settlement of the eighteenth century outstayed its welcome. It became stiff and unaccommodating. New aspirations were stifled: further liberations and enfranchisements were delayed. The Nemesis was the French Revolution. With the break-up of the political and social order came the decline of organized religion. Voltaire's prophecy was not isolated. Bishop Butler was of the same opinion—at any rate, as regards the Church of England. Out of the long period of unrest came in England the Victorian civilization and the religious prosperity of the nineteenth century. This, too, outstayed its welcome. Thought and order became too fixed and unyielding both in Church and State. They attempted to remain static when life must needs be dynamic. They persisted in settling down when the urgent need was to settle up. In the breakdown of the Victorian civilization, organized religion entered upon a period of storm and stress. As the unrest this time is world-wide, so will be the next settlement.

At the outset, the first instinct was to meet the difficulties by organization. We began to hear much of "organized

religion." The phrase remains and provokes heart-searching on our part. Does our modern English religious life give that predominant impression? If so, then something is amiss. Organization represents machinery, laborious contrivance, not spontaneous life. Organization has its rightful place. It is necessary for the conservation, application, and direction of life; but it is secondary. Life is primary. The divine Society, after Pentecost, was clearly an organism, with a divine, spontaneous life. We have drifted into organized religion. In the face of the decline of church-going, the Church organized itself. We may be so busy fulfilling organization that we miss spiritual life.

A year and a half ago, after three years of preliminary work as vicar of a very large industrial parish in the North of England, I found myself in the position of being able to ask in what direction we should move. The church was deeply rooted in the life of the community. Its activities were manifold. It had sixty years of unbroken success behind it. Its reputation was high. It grasped life at many points, and always vigorously. Its statistics were remarkable. There was the crowd feeling about its worship and about its many activities. Was there not a spiritual danger in all this? Did not the study of crowd psychology reveal the limitations of any crowd movement? Was there not an inevitable lack of personal initiative and individual decision? Did not our Lord repel crowds and challenge individuals? Could the life of a divine organism deepen and expand in any other way? In February, 1926, a parochial mission was indicated. It was no easy decision, but it was clearly God's will, shown in answer to prayer. There was no alternative to obedience. The date was chosen a year and a half ahead. It was made clear that the movement must grow slowly. At the commencement, there were only three of us, all men. We met weekly as a prayer group. By the end of the second meeting the principles were formulated, after urgent prayer for guidance. They were as follows: The first was prayer. No actions were to be taken unless they were clearly indicated as God's will. We were to wait upon God, and not to anticipate his will. The second principle was sincerity: a sincere desire to know his will: a sincere attempt to be purged of false valuations and distorted perspectives. There followed naturally the principle of obedience, not to a human leader, but to the will of God, as made known to individuals and much more to the fellowship. To this end there were to be no committees. The fourth principle was love and trust of one another; for how, otherwise, could we expect the operation of God, who is Love? Joyousness was the fifth and last principle. It came last,

because it was dependent upon the first four. It would be the gift of God, as in the New Testament, not our achievement. It was not to be the product of results obtained, for the seeking of results short-circuits the grace of God. It was to be the joy of together doing God's will and together realizing God's presence.

The meetings of a prayer group were to be held weekly. The procedure was carefully defined. The meeting began with systematic and concise instruction on prayer. This was dictated verbatim. At all the early meetings (we were four men by now) we concentrated on instruction in the practice of the presence of God. This was clearly the heart of prayer. Unless the mind addresses itself to this, God either remains an abstract idea, for He is infinite and we are finite, or the mind fastens upon a limited aspect of God and neglects the rest of the manifold revelation of His Being. We found in Holy Scripture twelve outstanding manifestations of God: God in Himself in his sovereign majesty; God the originator and upholder of life; God reigning in the world of men; God the Father of all mankind; God's divinely compassionate entry into the world of men; God's human sharing and fellow-feeling; God the Son's compassionate sacrifice; God the Son, the victor and lord of life; God the Spirit, the illuminator of the mind; God the Spirit, the power-giver to the will; God the Spirit, the educator of the heart; God the Spirit, the life-giver to the divine Society. After this systematic and dictated instruction, in which one aspect of God was dealt with each week, there followed the actual practice of the presence of God on the lines of the week's instruction. After thanksgiving and intercession the prayers for the week were drafted. Great stress was to be laid on the principle: "They that believed were of one heart and of one soul"; and "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." This condition involves a spiritual comradeship of love and trust, but it also implies unity of outlook and aim, which was secured by the agreed prayers for the week.

In the third month the second prayer group was started. This was for women, as the first had been for men only. No one was individually to be urged to join it. The privilege of joining one or other of the groups was offered to the church-people in general. The offer was open only for a few days. By the time it was withdrawn we had sixteen members of the two groups, all of whom accepted the principles of prayer, sincerity, unqualified obedience to the will of God, love and trust of one another, joyousness.

At the end of seven months, it was indicated that a further step was to be taken. In consequence the beginning of a Mission year was announced to the church, and a Mission Fellowship was founded. What work should develop was a question which had not yet been approached. The work was to grow out of the life. It was the life which mattered. The two closed prayer groups were merged into one open one, which met weekly in church. The condition of joining the Fellowship was the taking of a pledge of a year's prayer and service for the Mission. The five principles were to be kept constantly in mind. There was to be no compulsion, no assigning of tasks. The work was to be indicated by the Holy Spirit in answer to the prayers of all, and each task was to be carried out spontaneously and by voluntary service. The aim was personal decision, initiative, courage, spontaneity. Freedom within a fellowship was clearly the New Testament principle. Modern life makes most people subordinate members of large organizations. This is notably so in the case of wage-earners. There is all the time a drift towards having the decisions which affect actions relegated to a small committee, leaving responsibilities to the few representatives, receiving one's opinions as members of a crowd, subject to mass suggestion, whether the crowd of the political meeting or the crowd of newspaper readers. In consequence we get fellowship without freedom, without spontaneity, without original thinking or personal decision on the part of the great majority of people. All of which is convenient to most people, but has a lowering and morally devitalizing effect upon character. Because this spirit of an agreeable and unconscious moral bondage easily spreads to the spiritual life, and Churchpeople are not free from the temptation to leave the Church's thought and life to be settled by the few, and because that unrealized servile temper is foreign to the mind of Christ, the interpretation of the Holy Spirit's will was to be the task of the whole Fellowship, and the detailed carrying out invariably the product of individual decision.

Figures, statistics, records of work done, results were to be entirely secondary. We were not an organization carrying out a work. We were an organism living a life based upon the will of God. This distinction was vital. We were not concerned to undertake a work and to ask God to help us. We were concerned to live, by God's grace, a life, out of which certain tasks would arise.

On the Sunday when the Mission year began there was a great number of communicants. It was evident that the general conception had appealed to the people. But when the principles were enunciated there was a very pronounced hesita-

tion on the part of the great majority. We had not anticipated otherwise. There is a striking similarity about the early stages of all spiritual movements. Adherents come singly. In our case, out of a total of more than two thousand communicants, twenty-four, all told, were enrolled at this stage as members of the Mission Fellowship. Within four weeks there were forty. Before many weeks, there were eight weekly prayer groups, in most cases conducted by lay people. A visitation of the homes of the Sunday School children was carried out in a delightful spirit. There was a spontaneous revival of a derelict morning Sunday School which expanded rapidly from one teacher and a handful of children to a body of a hundred and thirty children, and eighteen teachers. The charm of it is that it has not been organized, but it grew naturally, and the Mission spirit of joyousness has marked it all along.

The next main objective became clear during the autumn. It was to be the personal visitation of every one of the five thousand houses of the parish. Each group of forty houses was to be under the pastoral care of a District Worker. The title of District Visitor was deliberately avoided, as connoting in the public mind some suggestion of superiority of status. These workers were to be men or women. Every four Workers were to be grouped under a District Agent, a man, who would be responsible for getting into touch with the men within the area. A card index system was prepared in advance, a separate card being allotted to each house, and about one hundred and sixty MS. books for the use of agents and workers were compiled. The latest burgess rolls were copied into the books, and much further information was recorded.

In the eleventh month, in January, 1927, the scope of the work was laid before the parish and the needed volunteers were asked for. In the sequel, we have had to call upon a very limited number to offer to undertake a second district, and a third of the District Agencies have not yet been filled, but we have a hundred and forty-three people doing the work of the Mission, all, it will be noted, being people who had offered themselves voluntarily and had not been individually approached.

The eleventh and twelfth months were the hardest time. The need had arrived for challenging the Church to accept the spiritual demands of the Mission upon the personal life and to manifest the New Testament qualities of courage, self-sacrifice, and devoted service to our Lord. For eight weeks we were constrained to maintain the pressure of the appeal. There was much passive resistance. It did not make us anxious about the outcome of the Mission, for we were clearly following the Spirit's guidance, but we were distressed, and it was not always

easy to carry out our fifth principle of joyousness. At the end of eight weeks we became happier. We were in process of getting enough volunteers to carry out the work of visitation, and God made it clear that we were to press for no more.

In the fourteenth month the Bishop of the diocese commissioned the workers and authorized the issue of further commissions at my discretion. In his commission, which took place at a Confirmation service, these are the salient words: "Now, therefore, that your faith may be the more confirmed, and your hands strengthened for the work before you, I, as Bishop and chief pastor of this diocese, hereby authorize and commission you to undertake and perform such ministries as the Vicar of the parish shall in his discretion entrust to you."

Shortly afterwards the books and the supply of the first Mission letter were issued, with instructions as follows:

"The first principle is faith in our Lord, belief in His promises, and obedience to His will.

The second is that each should seek God's will by prayer, and act upon it.

The third is the spiritual comradeship of all Mission workers. That is a purpose of the prayer groups.

These houses are your pastoral care. You will pray for the people, deliver Mission letters, visit the sick, explain the Mission, interest people in the work of the church, look up absentees, etc."

Then followed details as to reporting.

We are now in the nineteenth month of the preparation. In five weeks' time, in September, the Mission begins. We have three preaching stations set up in the parish, at which regular, open-air Mission meetings are being held; a week-end Retreat for Mission workers has been arranged; other enterprises are being developed. We believe that the coming ten days of the Mission itself will be very fruitful.

But we are even more deeply concerned with the wider issues than with the local. For a number of years missions have been sparingly undertaken. The conditions and the temper of the times have been felt to be unsuitable. Men have been preoccupied with political and economic issues. The ferment of the times has not been favourable for pressing the deeper issues of the personal life upon a population absorbed in questions of social conditions and economic standards. This hesitation has seemed to many the more justified, in that the reaction from the political and economic tension has seemed almost inevitably to be pleasure-seeking, and not serious spiritual thought. Has not the world now reached the saturation point of agitation and unrest? Are there not indications that it is becoming ready to react in the direction of religion?

What religion, other than Christianity, can meet the opportunity and the need? Are there not certain qualities of discipleship which are necessary for the fruitful presentation of Christianity? Are they not evident in the New Testament? Is not the Acts of the Apostles redolent of those qualities? Are not the principles which we have been led to adopt in the development of the movement recorded above very close to those of the New Testament? Do they not appear, from the study of historical movements of Christian renewal, to be essential for such renewals?

The second issue with which we are concerned is the pastoral work of the laity. The parochial system tends, with the constant growth of population, and the prevalent shortage of clergy, to degenerate into a congregationalism, which leaves the bulk of the people unshepherded. Ought not the general objective to be the putting into commission, to a far larger extent than has hitherto been contemplated, of the pastoral care of souls? Otherwise there is little prospect of establishing some contact, however slight, with every house in a large parish. It is something very different from the visitation of the houses of the poor by more well-to-do lady visitors. It is the visitation of all houses alike, without the intention of proselytizing from other communions, by devotionally trained visitors of either sex and of varying economic status, who are sent by the parish priest and the Church. We have found that a great artizan population welcomes such visits and respects the Church for undertaking the task.

We in this parish are not likely to treat the matter as a temporary experiment. I could not imagine our abandoning the joyous spiritual comradeship, the prayer, the sincerity, the obedience to God's will, that lie at the heart of the movement.

H. LOVELL CLARKE.

ISRAEL AND EDOM: THE ORACLE OF OBADIAH—I.

JEROME,* commenting on Obadiah, explains *Edom* in his tropological manner as meaning either the Jews of his time, or more properly the heretics—enemies of the Church of God. If this was the Christian tradition in Palestine, the Church must have taken over from the Synagogue the name of *Edom* as expressive of an object of "perennial hatred" (Ezek. xxxv. 4). The

* Op. vi., 365, ed. Vall.

entire oracle of Obadiah is an expression of this bitter hatred, and before examining this least of the "little prophets," I propose to review briefly the historic causes which made the relations of Israel and Edom in later days largely a vendetta of alternating savagery.

The materials for the early stages of such a review consist of:

(a) The genealogies in Gen. xxxvi., which undoubtedly were taken from written Edomite sources.*

(b) The picturesque stories contained in J. and E. In dealing critically with all these sources in Genesis, it is necessary to keep in mind that we are dealing with tribes, and not with the doings of individuals. In fact, in regard to Edom, our sources make this clear. *Esau, he is Edom* (Gen. xxxvi. 1, 8, 19),† and when Esau comes to meet Jacob, he is at the head, not of his family, but of 400 men (Gen. xxxii. 7, xxxiii. 1).

So we shall seek to discern in these records, not the personal history of Esau, but the movements of the tribes which formed the people *Edom*. And throughout it is necessary to be on the watch for the graphic corruption of אֶדֶם for אֶדָם—which is such a frequent cause of perplexity and error.

Esau is the brother of Jacob. This is a recurring formula (Deut. xxiii. 7; Hos. xii. 4; Mal. i. 2), and points to a consciousness of a close racial connection between Israel and Edom. Esau is a brother, while Moab and Ammon are very distant connections. If we may judge from the proper names preserved in our sources, the languages of Israel and Edom were very much akin,‡ perhaps almost identical. Esau is the *elder* brother, a position which seems to indicate that when the B'ne Israel first arrived in Palestine, they found that the Edomites had already established a settlement in that country. It is very probable that Edom like Israel had a wandering Aramean for their father (Deut. xxvi. 5), and had arrived in Palestine in a previous wave of Aramean immigration. The character of the people at that time was that ascribed by legend to their ancestor. They were a nomadic race, like the Bedouin Arabs, living on hunting and robbery. The B'ne Israel, a semi-nomadic and agricultural people—therefore on a higher grade of development—seem, by some course of fraudulent treachery, to have prevailed over the simpler Edomites, and to have excluded them from the more fertile districts of the land, confining them to dry, rocky, and unfruitful places. This may be inferred from the

* Meyer, *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 384.

† Verse 43 ascribed to P. says הוּא אֶשָׁן אֶבְרִי אֶדֶם (see Dillmann, *Genesis*, vi., p. 382).

‡ See Driver, *Genesis*, 317; Moritz, *Edomitische Genealogien Z.A.W.*, N.F., Bd. 3, Heft 2, p. 81 f.

terms of the oracle preserved by J., which emphasizes the position of inferiority to which the Edomites had been reduced:

“ Away from the fat places of the land will thy dwelling be
And from the dew of heaven from above.
And upon thy sword thou wilt live
And wilt serve thy brother.
But when thou shalt exert thy strength
Then thou wilt break his yoke from off thy neck” (Gen. xxvii. 39-40.)

The confused and contradictory accounts of Esau's marriages (Gen. xxvi. 34, xxviii. 9, xxxvi. 2) reveal the fact that the tribes of Edom, while yet wandering in Palestine, strengthened themselves by the inclusion and absorption of portions of various indigenous peoples. First-named are the Hittites, a branch of whom was certainly settled in South Palestine at this period* (Gen. x. 15, xxiii., xxvii. 46; Ezek. xvi. 3). Next come the Ishmaelites of Nebaioth, nomad Bedouins of the Arabian desert, who, in character and habits, were very similar to the Edomites. These alliances show that the Edomites had kept moving more and more to the south since the time when they first came in contact with the B'ne Israel in Gilead (Gen. xxxii. 22). Apparently they had been steadily pushed southwards into the country afterwards known as Edom (Gen. xxxvi. 6), and here they incorporated elements of the Chorites, the native population.† This latter people had, from the dawn of history, been in possession of the wild rocky ravine where stood the city of Seir. Their name seems to mean troglodytes—cave-dwellers,‡ and testifies that it was they who hewed out for dwellings the wonderful caves of Petra.§ Probably they occupied the whole country down to the Gulf of Akaba on the Red Sea.|| In the strange story of the incursion of Chedorlaomer and three other Eastern kings into Palestine (a story which I believe with Dr. Budge¶ to have some historic event behind it), the invaders are said to have smitten the Chorites in their mountain Seir as far as the terebinth of Paran (Gen. xiv. 6), that is, Elath at the head of the Gulf of Akaba.

* Cowley, *Hittites*, p. 15; *Cambridge Ancient History*, iii. 133.

† In *Genesis* xxxvi. 2 קרני is certainly an error for קרני. See v. 20. So Dillmann and others.

‡ Driver, *Deut.*, 38.

§ See Jerome, *Op.* vi., 370. *Omnis australis regio Idumeorum de Eleutheropoli usque Petram et Ailam (hoc est enim possessio Esau) in specubus habitatiunculas habet. Et propter nimios calores solis quia meridiana provincia est subterraneis tuguriis utitur.*

|| Kittel, *Gesch.*, i., eds. 5 and 6, 22, 31.

¶ *Babylonian Life and History*, p. 35.

Behind this distant time we cannot penetrate, and we may safely regard the Chorites as aborigines of the country afterwards known as Edom. The boundary between this district and Judah seems to be specified in Judg. i. 36 (amended* from LXX Luc), "and the territory of the Edomites extended from the Scorpion-pass to the Rock (Petra) and further." Kadeshbarnea, where or around which the tribes of Israel abode for so long a period, was just to the west of the boundary line (Num. xx. 1-16).†

The Edomites made a complete conquest of this territory and dispossessed the Chorites (Deut. ii. 12, 22). We must not think that the latter were absolutely driven out or exterminated. Like the Canaanites in Palestine, they probably continued to live among and intermarry with the conquering race. This seems to be the fact underlying the account of the three sons—that is, clans or tribes—born to Esau by a Chorite wife (Gen. xxxvi. 14). The time of this conquest is not clearly stated, but an indication of date may be found in the fact that the country is called *Aduma* (that is, Edom) in an Egyptian record of the time of Merneptah (cir. 1230), which records the admission of Shasu (Bedouin) from that country with their herds to the pastures of Sukkoth and Pithom—the Wady Tumilat.‡ The Edomites were therefore settled in their new country long before the tribes of Israel left Kadesh for Palestine. Meyer suggests the twelfth century as the period of conquest, but it seems that this took place a little earlier.

The Edomites, like the Chorites before them, seem to have had, prior to the establishment of regal government, a system of tribal rulers. At the head of each tribe or clan we find an *Aluph*, clan-chief or sheik (Gen. xxxvi. 15-19, 29-30, 40-41). The word means a chiliarch or chief of a thousand,§ but such statement of numbers is purely conventional. According to the ancient song in Exodus (xv. 15), this was the form of government in Edom when the Israelites were leaving Egypt.|| Before the two races came in contact, an important change had taken place in Edom. Esau was the elder brother in the sense that the institution of kingship arose in his tribes long before even the abortive experiment of Abimelek was tried in Israel (Gen. xxxvi. 21), and when the B'ne Israel sought to journey to Transjordan they were met by a *king* of Edom. There are

* Meyer, *op. cit.*, 388, and n. 2.

† Gray, *Numbers*, 266-7.

‡ Brugsch, *Hist. Eg. E.T.*, ii., 133; Meyer, *op. cit.*, 338.

§ Dillmann, *Genesis*, 386.

|| In view of Exod. xv. 15, I can see no reason to alter אֶלְפִי to אֶלֶף—the clan or thousand (1 Sam. xvii. 18) (Mayer, 330). We should translate "the sheik of Teman," etc.

two differing accounts of this transaction. In Numbers (xx. 14-21; see Judg. ii. 16-18), a passage through Edom was requested and refused, and the king came out with a large army to prevent it. Israel had to turn away and make a long circuit round Edom. In Deut. (ii. 2-8), they are represented as making a peaceful passage at a later time *through** Edomite territory. I think the earlier account (J. E.) more likely to be true. It is what might be expected from the increased self-consciousness of tribes who had now a settled territory united under a strong monarch. Deut. displays throughout a more friendly feeling towards Edom than that of any other source, a point to which I shall advert later.

A document of great value has been preserved to us in the Edomite list of kings (Gen. xxxvi. 31-39). It is to be noted that the kingship is not hereditary—no king succeeds his father, nor is there any exclusive royal city. It would rather appear that these kings were powerful chieftains who, by success in war, obtained the supremacy, and were strong enough to hold it for life. Kings, in fact, of the pattern of Saul.

These kings suffered a considerable diminution of territory and population when the tribe of Judah entered upon the land adjoining Edom. The Edomite tribes of the Calebites, and some† other of the Kennizites (Judg. i. 12f.), Jerachmeelites and Kainites (1 Sam. xxvii. 10, xxx. 29), Qorachites (1 Chron. ii. 43), and Rekabites (Jer. xxxv. 7), with the territories occupied by them, allied themselves with Judah, and became not only loyal citizens, but active combatants in the wars of conquest. The accession of these tribes must have been a welcome addition in strength and importance to the struggling tribe of Judah, while Edom was weakened in proportion by the loss of these western districts and their inhabitants.‡

The list of kings of Edom has suggested interesting identifications of some of them with personages otherwise well known. The first, Bela ben Beor, was considered by the Targum to be the celebrated soothsayer Bileam ben Beor (Balaam). This view was accepted by Nöldeke, and after him by Hommel,§ Sayce,|| Cheyne,¶ Meyer,** and others. The argument as stated by Meyer is shortly this. Bileam says, "From *Aram* Balak, King of Moab, brought me, from the mountains of the East" (Num. xxiii. 7). *Aram* should be *Edom*. The "mountains of the East" are not suited to *Aram*. Bileam lived "on the river of the land of the *B'ne Ammo* (Num. xxii. 5). There

* Driver, *Deut.*, 34 n.

† See Nöldeke, *Enc. Bib.*, art. "Edom."

‡ Meyer, *op. cit.*, 400-408; *Cambridge Ancient Hist.*, ii., 366, 390, 393, 406.

§ *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, 153.

|| *Early History Heb.*, 224.

¶ *Enc. Bib.*, art. "Bela."

** *Op. cit.*, 375-80.

is considerable authority (Heb., Syr., Latin)* for the reading *Ammon*. The whole story shows that Bileam cannot have lived far from *Moab*. He rides on a she-ass between vineyards, attended only by two servants. If he had travelled from *Pethor* on the Euphrates, the journey would have taken months—in fact, a similar journey took Ezra and his caravan four months (Ezra vii. 8, 9). And Edom was renowned for wisdom (Jer. xlix. 7; Ob. 8). Then there is the striking similarity of names, and the identity of the father's name. It savours of audacity to question an opinion held by so many great men, but with Driver† I must confess to some doubt. It is hard to think that the first king of Edom, who must have been a rough soldier gaining his position by the sword, was also a wandering soothsayer whose incantations could be hired by promises of money (Num. xxii. 18) or honours (xxiv. 11), and who is represented as predicting the ruin of his own country (Num. xxiv. 18); nor does Balak treat him like a brother king. The whole tenor of the story in J. E. seems to be adverse to this combination. Bileam may have been an Edomite, but not an Edomite king.

The second king, Jobab ben Zerach, has been made the subject of a very curious theory. In the LXX, in a postscript to the Book of *Job* it states: "This man is interpreted out of the Syrian book as living in the Ausitis on the borders of Idumea and Arabia, and his name before was Jobab, and he himself was the son of a father, Zara, one of the sons of Esau, and of a mother, Bossora, so that he was the fifth from Abraham."

Now the land of *Uz* where Job traditionally lived was a long distance from the Edom of Jobab. It seems to have included Trachonitis, in its widest sense including Iturea (S. Luc iii. 1), and was roughly equivalent to the ancient *Bashan*.‡ Jeremiah (xxv. 20, 21) treats the land of *Uz* as distinct from Edom. In his time or shortly afterwards, in consequence of Assyria having led away captive much of the Israelite population of the East Jordanic country (2 Kings xv. 29), Edomite elements seem to have settled in this desolated region of Israel. So Lam. iv. 21: "daughter of Edom dwelling in the land of *Uz*" seems to refer to an Edomite colony or settlement in that district. I think that this (among other outrages of a like kind) is referred to by Ezek. xxxv. 10: "Because thou didst say, the *two nations* and the *two lands* shall be mine, and I (LXX) will possess them—whereas Jahweh was there," and xxxvi. 5, "they made *my land* their possession." But all this was 500 years after the time of King Jobab.

* See Kittel, *Bib. Heb.*, ad loc.

† Genesis, 317.

‡ See Wetzstein, Appendix to Delitzsch, *Job E.T.*, ii., 437; Pinches in Hastings' Dict., art. "*Uz*."

It seems quite certain that two, at any rate, of Job's friends, Eliphaz of Teman, the city celebrated for wisdom (Jer. xlix. 7), and Bildad of Shuach, belonged to Edom.* But there is really no similarity between the Hebrew names "Hiob" and "Jobab," although there is some resemblance between the Greek forms of these names. This postscript seems to be either a Midrash or an Alexandrian invention to prove that the pious Job, though not an Israelite, was yet a descendant of Abraham.

The next king, Chusham, has been made the subject of a brilliant (and to me a convincing) theory. The story of Kushan Rishathaim, "the double-dyed villain," has always been a mystery (Judg. iii. 8-11). It is simply impossible to believe that in the circumstances of the period referred to, a petty king from the Euphrates could make a conquest of Judah, or some part of it, and retain his conquest for eight years.† But if here, as often elsewhere, we read Edom for *Aram*,‡ we begin to see the possibility of a coherent story. We may next discard the notion of "double villainy," and regard שר as equivalent to שר in the sense of "chieftain." The word is so used of Jephtha (Judg. xi. 8-11). We should then have "Kushan, chieftain of something."

Now we are ready for the ingenious conjecture of Marquart.§ He turns to the catalogue in Genesis xxxvi. of "the kings who reigned in the land of Edom before any king reigned over the children of Israel" (v. 31). From this catalogue he extracts (with a correction from the LXX) "*Chusham*" from the land of the Temanites, "and Chusham died, and instead of him reigned *Hadad* . . . and the name of his city was *Ittaim*" (v. 34). Now if it be assumed that Chusham, whose city is not named, lived in the same place as his successor, we obtain instead of "Kushan of the double villainy," Cushman, chief of *Ittaim*,|| King of Edom. This identification cannot be said to be proved, but the conjecture is one of the finest I have ever come across, and in the absence of further light, is a good working hypothesis.

Now the story can be understood. It is almost natural that Chusham, King of Edom, should seek to recover the territories which had allied themselves with the rising state of Judah, and he seems to have conquered, and for a time occupied them, until at last he was dislodged by elements of the Kenizzite tribes led by Othniel, who seems to be a real historical figure. The importance of this transaction lies in the fact that this is the

* Driver—Gray, *Job*, p. 28.

† See *Cambridge Ancient History*, iii., 385.

‡ See Klostermann, *Gesch.*, 122; Kittel, *Gesch.*, ii., ed. 2, p. 82.

§ *Fundamente isr. u. jüd Geschichte*, 1896, p. 11.

|| Heb. עֵיטַי, LXX. Γεθσαιμ = עֵיטַי.

first act in the long series of fratricidal conflicts with varying issues which formed the future history of Edom and Judah.

The fourth King *Hadad*, "he smote Midian in the territory of Moab," is thus credited with an historical event. This occurrence has been brought into connection with the victories of Gideon,* and apparently with good reason. The combination which Gideon had to face was far more than a mere Bedouin raid into settled land. It was an alliance of Midian, Amalek, and other Arabian tribes, who swept over the land from Bethshan to Gaza, and occupied it for seven years (Judg. vi. 1-6). It is reasonable to suppose that this alliance was a menace to other nations beside Judah, and that after Gideon had driven the Midianites across the Jordan, Hadad seized the opportunity to fall on the retreating host, and aid in dispersing them. Midian never again made war at the head of such imposing hosts.

As to Baalhanan—the seventh king—a very interesting theory has been put forward—namely, that he was David.† That David's first name was *Elhanan* (or Baalhanan) has long been suspected, since it is stated that Elhanan ben Jari, a Bethlehemite, slew Goliath the Gittite (2 Sam. xxi. 19),‡ a feat elsewhere ascribed to David (1 Sam. xvii. 50). And apparently at the head of the thirty heroic followers of David is placed Elhanan, son of Dodi (of) Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxiii. 24, 1 Chron. xi. 27.)

Now if with Sayce we amend here to "*Elthanan who is Dodi*" (David), the coincidence is very striking. But why should David appear in a list of Edomite kings? Surely because he conquered Edom.§ This seems quite clear. "And David acquired reputation, and when he returned he smote Edom|| in the Valley of Salt (2 Kings xiv. 7), eighteen thousand. And he put garrisons in the whole of Edom, and all Edom was in servitude to David" (2 Sam. viii. 13, 14). This is a fact of great importance. David was a Judean. He must have known many details, now entirely lost to us, of the incursion of King Chusham and what Judah had suffered during his occupation. David's attack upon and conquest of Edom, and the savage ferocities which followed it (1 Kings xi. 15), must be regarded as a vendetta—a reprisal of ancient wrongs—and these events, the invasion by Chusham and David's cruel subjugation of Edom, give the key to all future relations of the two countries. Further, the possession of the Gulf of Akaba with its important ports of

* Ewald, *Gesch. E.T.*, ii., 336; Meyer, *op. cit.*, 381.

† Sayce, *Hibbert Lect.*, p. 53.

‡ See on the text of this passage Driver, *Samuel*, i., 274.

§ See *Cambridge Ancient History*, iii. 393.

|| This is the reading of the LXX (see Driver, *Samuel*, i., 218).

Elath and Ession-Geber was of enormous importance to Solomon's trade relations (1 Kings ix. 26).

If this view of the course of events be accepted, it is a striking coincidence that both in Hebrew and in Edomite tradition the predecessor of Elhanan-David was *Saul*, who in the Edomite record was of Rehoboth on the river. This can hardly mean Rehoboth-Ir near Nineveh (Gen. x. 11), nor Rehoboth on the Euphrates,* nor can the river be the Euphrates. All these places are too distant from Edom. There was a Rehoboth in Gebalene in North Edom.† Compare Gebal, Ps. lxxxiii. 7 and Γεβαλὲμ (2 Sam. viii. 13 LXX). Saul made war on Edom (1 Sam. xiv. 47), and may have occupied this place, and prepared the way for David's conquest. All this is, of course, conjectural and not proved; but it is not unlikely. Perhaps we may allow ourselves to imagine the Edomite historiographer with a heavy heart entering in his list of kings: Saul (the captor) of Rehoboth and Baalhanan, the subjugator of his country, and placing under them the name of Hadad II., presumably the king whom David overthrew,‡ and probably put to death (1 Kings xi. 16). A son, or grandson, of this king, Hadad III., was, as a little child, saved by the loyalty of faithful servants from David's massacres and carried into Egypt. Here he grew up and married a daughter of the reigning Pharaoh. But hearing that David and Joab were dead, he returned to Edom, and, to some extent, restored the royal power (1 Kings xi. 14-25).§ He seems to have had some stronghold in Edom (perhaps *Seir*), and to have made constant attacks on Solomon's kingdom.|| But the access through Ession-Geber to the Red Sea was not lost to Israel, and was held for many years after this period (1 Kings xxii. 49; 2 Chron. xx. 36).

Edom does not seem to have retained its shadow of independence very long. In the reign of Jehoshaphat it is expressly stated: "There was no king in Edom, a prefect was king" (1 Kings xxii. 48), and when the kings of Israel and Judah made a joint attack on Moab, this prefect-king of Edom went with them (2 Kings iii. 9, 26). It has been suggested that the destruction of Jehoshaphat's fleet at Ession-Geber (1 Kings xxii. 47) was in some way due to Edomite action.¶ And this is likely enough, since, under his son Jehoram, Edom revolted from Judah and

* Dillmann, *Genesis*, vi., 387, 389.

† *Robooth*, Urbs alia juxta flumen ubi erat rex Edom et usque hodie est presidium in regione gebalena et vicus grandis qui hoc vocabulo nuncupatur (Lagarde, *Onomastica*, 176, 280).

‡ Meyer, *op. cit.*, 371.

§ In v. 25 we read with LXX (Luc): "This is the wrong which Hadad wrought, he oppressed Israel and reigned over Edom" (see Burney, *Kings*, 162; Meyer, *op. cit.* 361, n. 1).

|| Kittel, *Gesch.*, ii., 219.

¶ *Cambridge Ancient Hist.*, ii., 366.

set up a king. An attempt to subdue them was unsuccessful, and Edom remained independent (2 Kings viii. 20-22). *Amaziah* defeated the Edomites in the Valley of Salt, David's old battlefield, and captured Petra, and his son Azariah-Uzziah recovered the port of Elath (2 Kings xiv. 7-20). This port remained in the possession of Judah till the time of Ahaz, when Rezin restored it to Edom (2 Kings xvi. 6).—But even before this event, Edom was independent of Judah. A king of Edom—Kausmalaka—is mentioned in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser in 732.* This name is interesting because its first element is the name of the Edomite god *Kaus* or *Kos* (called by Josephus† *Koze*), which occurs in many late names and inscriptions.‡ The form of this king's name reminds us of the words *Jahweh malak* (Ps. xcix. 1), and doubtless has a similar meaning. But little is known of the religion of Edom, but it may be noted that the Divine name *El* is found in the proper names Eliphaz and Re'uel (Gen. xxxvi. 10), and in many names in late Nabatean-Arabian inscriptions.§

It has been conjectured from the name Obed-edom (2 Sam. vi. 10; 1 Chron. xiii. 14), that there was a god—*Edom*. Certainly the form *Obed* or *Abd* is usually found prefixed to the name of a god in Semitic proper names, but the rule is not universal, and there is no other evidence of the existence of such a deity.|| It is hard to think of a Philistine who was an adherent of Jahweh bearing the name of an Edomite god, and the chronicler makes Obed-edom a Levite (1 Chron. xv. 18-21; xvi. 5; xxvi. 4). In view of the variety of the LXX renderings of the name we may suspect some corruption.¶ I do not think any decision on the point can be arrived at on the materials available.

The history which has been sketched above with its alternating successes was calculated to produce feelings of bitter hatred on both sides. Some insight into these feelings is afforded by the oracle of Amos.

“For three transgressions of Edom and for four I will not reverse the doom

Because he pursued his brother with the sword and destroyed pity for him

And kept** his anger for ever

And ever maintained his fury” (Amos i. 11).

* Schrader, *K.A.T.*, ed. 2, p. 150; *Cambridge Ancient Hist.*, ii., 382.

† *Ant.*, xv., 7, 9.

‡ Meyer, *op. cit.*, 351, n. 4.

§ Moritz, *u.s.*, 84.

|| Driver, *Sam. i.*, p. 206.

† In 2 Sam. vi. 10 and 1 Chron. xiii. 14, 'Αββεδαπὰ; in other places in 1 Chron., 'Αββεδδμ. See Cook, *Enc. Bib.*, art. “Obededom.”

** Reading יָטַר, Lat. *et tenuerit*, for יָטַרָה.

It is somewhat surprising that attempts have been made to relegate this oracle to post-exilic times on the ground that Edom at this time was not in a position to take up such an attitude in regard to Judah—the Edomites being, in fact, subject to the Jews.* Were the old wrongs so likely to be forgotten—the oppression of Chusham, the raids of Hadad III., the defeat of Jehoram, the destruction of the ships at Ession-Geber? And Amos himself reveals (i. 6-9) another potent cause of hatred: Edom carried on a vigorous slave-trade which did not exclude their brethren, the Jews. In the great emporiums of Gaza and Tyre they bought masses of slaves, and, like all nomads, knew very well how to dispose of them.† In view of later events this testimony of Amos is very valuable, and it is certainly genuine.

It is a very curious fact that the attitude of Deut. towards the Edomites is much more kindly than that of any other Jewish writing. The children of Esau must not be attacked, nor their land taken, because Jahweh has given Mount Seir as a possession to them, and driven out the Chorites (Deut. ii. 5, 22). An Edomite must not be abhorred; in fact, his posterity may be incorporated with Israel in the third generation (Deut. ii. 38). This is quite unlike any prophetic utterance before or after. What can be the cause of this tenderness to Edom? Hölscher suggests that the story in Deut. of the peaceable passage of Israel through Edom was varied from the account of J. in order to remove from Israel the stigma of cowardice! He also says that these utterances are post-exilic, and that the political aspirations of Judah for a hegemony over Edom had long since been forgotten.‡ He seems to ignore the action against Edom of Judas the Maccabee (1 Mac. v. 3) and John Hyrcanus. But in any case it is quite impossible to imagine such sentiments being expressed at any time after the events of 586.

I venture to suggest another reason for this friendly tone towards Edom. In the time of Hezekiah we hear of a league against Sargon, headed by the King of Ashdod, of which league Judah, Edom, and Moab were members, and reliance was placed on the co-operation of Egypt.§ Sargon promptly sent his general, who took Ashdod (Isa. xx. 1), and the league fell to pieces—the King of Edom again becoming tributary to Assyria.|| This is the only recorded occasion in their long history on which Judah and Edom were allies and not enemies, and the memory of this friendly co-operation, and the hope that it might be repeated on some future occasion, may perhaps have created in Judah a better feeling towards Edom, an echo of which survives

* Norwack, *Die Kl. Propheten*, iii., p. 324.

† Meyer, *op. cit.*, 385.

‡ Holscher in *Z.A.W.*, Bd. 40, Heft 3-4, 165-6.

§ *Cambridge Anc. Hist.*, ii., 388.

|| Kittel, *Gesch.*, ii., 502.

in the utterances of the Deuteronomist. Some trace of the same feeling may be discerned when in the fourth year of Zedekiah an embassy from Edom arrived in Jerusalem to arrange some common action against the Chaldeans (Jer. xxvii. 3). But the terrible catastrophe of 586 and the joy with which the Edomites took part in the sack of Jerusalem extinguished finally and for all time any such momentary feelings of friendliness.*

This infamous conduct on the part of a people whom Deut. had been able still to describe as "thy brother" was never forgotten. A chorus of reprobation and hatred is in future maintained in the writings of the prophets, and perhaps the bitterest and most concentrated expression of this feeling is in the little book of Obadiah.

W. W. CANNON.

(To be concluded.)

A PLEA FOR "THE FLESH"

WITH which I wish I dare couple a faint and hopeless protest against "Resurrection." Seven times over the Apostles' Creed is printed in full in our Book of Common Prayer. Some will grieve that in the new Prayer Book four times an important word has been altered. For no one will claim that "Body" is the ordinary rendering of *Sarx* or *Caro* or *Basar*. I must not speak as if I had verified it, but I fancy the Greek and Latin versions render the Hebrew *Basar* by *Sarx* and *Caro*; and, with more assurance, I suppose the English renders all three words constantly in our Bible by "Flesh." The Reformers changed the word in three cases in the Creed, at Mattins and Evensong and in the Catechism. But in the other four, the three Baptismal Services and the Visitation of the Sick, all in the interrogative form, they translated "the Resurrection of the Flesh." Why they changed the word, Bishop Gibson, on the XXXIX Articles, remarks, is not known. I have only seen translations of the Creed into French and German and Dutch, but in these the word is *Chair*, *Fleisch*, and *Vleesch*. I have not heard if any others besides the English have substituted another word for that which most nearly represents the original.

The question to consider is whether the substitution is a gain. In order to answer this it is necessary to examine the force and meaning of that word "Flesh" as it stands in the Creeds.

* Since this was written, a similar view has been expressed by K. Budde, Z.A.W., N.F., 1926, Bd. 3, Heft 3-4, p. 212.

"FLESH" IN THE CREEDS.

For the word *Sarkos* (whence *Carnis* and "of the Flesh") is Eastern as well as Western. So it stood in the Roman Creed, which can be traced back to 150 or earlier, and in the Creed of Jerusalem, which in the fourth century was fused with the Nicene Creed to make what we use as the Nicene Creed. Still in 348 St. Cyril of Jerusalem was teaching his catechumens to recite "the Resurrection of the Flesh." We have no information, it seems, why the change was made to "of the dead."

Wheeler Robinson, in *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, analyzes the different meanings of the Hebrew *Basar*; and Dr. Darragh, in his *Resurrection of the Flesh*, examines with great thoroughness the uses of *Basar* and *Sarx*. For it is obvious to everyone that the word bears a different sense when our Lord prays to the Father who has "given Him power over all flesh," and when St. Paul speaks of the different flesh of men and of beasts. Among these uses the sense which fits the Creed is *Flesh* as meaning human nature. The most famous verse is in St. John's prologue, "The Word was made *Flesh*." It seems to be connected with the Risen Christ in St. John's second Epistle, "deceivers who confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh" (R.V.).

That "human nature" is what is meant by "flesh" where it occurs in the Nicene Creed is evident. *Incarnatus*, *Sarkothenta* contain the actual word; and the meaning is driven home by the phrase "and was made man." We may compare the equivalence in our Christmas Collect of "to take our nature upon Him" with "to take upon Him our flesh" in the Palm Sunday Collect. Or again in the *Quicumque vult* we say: "One not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God"; where "Flesh" and "Manhood" are parallel.

It is in the light of this use, surely, that we must interpret "the Resurrection of the Flesh." The Resurrection of Christ and of man hold together. "Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His Coming." We believe that "Christ did truly rise again from death with all things appertaining to the perfection of human nature." That is what we believe concerning our future life. "The Resurrection of the Flesh," wrote Dr. T. A. Lacey in *THEOLOGY* (May, 1912), "meant the raising of the whole man from death." And that is the interpretation given by Dr. Darragh as the result of his elaborate study.

GRADUAL CHANGE OF SENSE AND EMPHASIS

But Professor Whitehead, in his weighty Lowell Lectures on *Religion in the Making* (1927), reminds us of two important points which should be remembered: "In the framing of dogmas it is only possible to use ideas which have received a distinct, well-recognized signification. Also, no idea is determinate in a vacuum. It has its being as one of a system of ideas. A dogma is the expression of a fact as it appears within a certain sphere of thought. You cannot convey a dogma by merely translating the words; you must also understand the system of thought to which it is relevant."

This bears strongly on the question in hand. This sense of the word "Flesh" is Hebraic. But even in Hebrew thought "Flesh" had other meanings. It is, for instance, contrasted with "Spirit." When Christianity launched out into the Roman-Greek world it found in the common Hellenistic religion a system of thought which did not accept this Hebraic sense of the word "Flesh" as meaning man in the fulness of his being. In classical Greek we are told *Sarx* has always a physical connotation. In the current popular Platonism man consisted of two distinct entities, soul and body; and the Christian term "Flesh" was speedily identified with "body" by early Christian writers, such as Athenagoras, with that same notion of something from which the soul is detachable and able to live its life apart. The original, and we should hold the true, meaning was not lost, for it was enshrined in the Creeds, and the Christian Church had constantly the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in hand; but the struggle with Gnostic and Platonic influence gave the word "Flesh" a special and changed emphasis.

To popular Platonism, and the Hellenistic cult which it affected, the soul alone was real and immortal; the body was a mere exchangeable case, contemptible, or even evil in itself and the source of all evil to the soul. Matter itself was unreal or evil. The Christian Church was convinced that this was false doctrine, especially when it became clear that it struck at the very truth of the Incarnation, and all that it involved. The Church held tenaciously to the assurance that the future life was for man in his full nature, body and soul. Dr. Inge, in his *Plotinus* (xii. and xiii.), writes, "Christian teaching was unanimous that in some way or other the whole man, and not merely his ghost, is immortal."

But then it was discovered that the enemy were using the word "body" in a treacherous manner, as some today do the phrase "spiritual body," to mean really nothing more than

appearance or form; and thus, under cover of orthodox words, were teaching the same Greek tenet of the immortality of the soul alone. Hence Christian writers, such as St. Jerome, laid hold of the word "flesh" as something concrete, unmistakably material, which no heretic could circumvent. And so it was that "Flesh" and the "Resurrection of the Flesh" came to mean, in controversy certainly, and it would seem, commonly, the material body. The Athanasian Creed contains this other and inferior sense: "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man."

After which followed all those discussions, in St. Cyril of Jerusalem and others, right away down to recent centuries, which distress our present-day biological and evolutionary cast of mind, as to the manner in which the particles of that material body are to be reassembled at the Last Day.

It is to escape from what seem to us now impossible conceptions, I take it, that we are asked to surrender the word "Flesh" altogether in the Article of the Resurrection in the Apostles' Creed.

The whole matter is in the highest degree serious, because, for whatever reason, the preaching of the Living Hope, which thrilled those early Christians, and has been so mighty a religious force down the ages, has of late years been sorely lacking, both in proportion and conviction. Very different divines, Professor H. R. Mackintosh of Scotland, Professor McIntyre of Australia, Professor Shaw of Canada, Dean Inge in England, all note the failure of the preaching, and with deep regret. It would take too much space to give strong comment from all of these. But once more, to keep to our point, is the change from "Flesh" to "Body" going to help? Professor Shaw, for one, believes that what he calls the reduced or attenuated Christianity of today is due to indifference to the bodily aspect of the Resurrection (Preface to *Resurrection of Christ*, 1920).

PLEA FOR SURRENDER OF THE WORD "FLESH"

It does certainly appear from a survey of earlier Christian teaching, such as may be found in Dr. J. T. Darragh's *Resurrection of the Flesh*, or Dr. Sparrow-Simpson's *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, that the general conception has been of a reconstitution of the material elements of the dead body. Such an idea is repugnant to modern thought, and that is why the demand is made that the word "Flesh" in the Creed shall be surrendered, and the word "Body" be uniformly adopted in its stead. That word "Flesh," they say, is so wrapped up with gross and materialistic implications, that whatever nobler sense

it might bear, we cannot now disentangle it. To English people it will always suggest mere resuscitation of a corpse; and because we cannot believe that, the whole belief in a future life is being weakened. Our Reformers took on themselves to change the word in three instances; why not carry the thing through?

OBJECTIONS TO SURRENDER

To such a step there are various objections:

(a) *Mere resuscitation never the Christian Teaching.*

And first, it is not the case that those who have taught most emphatically the Resurrection of the flesh have understood it to mean mere resuscitation in the earthly state. My knowledge of the Fathers is very limited, but no ancient writer I know has so taught; certainly not Tertullian nor Jerome, who are two of the most literalist interpreters. Identity of substance there is, but of that substance transfigured and glorified. "This mortal shall put on immortality" is Tertullian's constant pæan in his *De Resurrectione Carnis*. Similarly St. Jerome in the *ad Pamachium*, fully expects glory and transcendence. There is no reason, on account of the word, why our people should hold unworthy views, I doubt if they do; or why, if they do hold them, they should not be disabused.

Does it seem hopeless to get back to the fulness and riches of that Hebraic sense of "the Flesh"? It is no doubt despair of this which counsels the surrender.

But if we recur to Whitehead's dictum, that a dogma must be understood in reference to the system of thought in which it was framed, there is fully enough to encourage us. For in the first place all three Creeds still hold their place in Christian thought. The Easterns, Gavin tells us in his *Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (1923), no less than the Westerns, recognize all of them as ecumenical. They are living formulas, in constant use, not dead documents. Their atmosphere is about us still. And in all of them there stand *Sarx, Caro, Flesh*, with that meaning of complete human nature in reference to Christ's Incarnation as an unquestionable feature of orthodox Christian belief. It would be easy for Christian preachers to point out that in the later article the "Flesh" means nothing less.

Nor do we depend only or chiefly on the Creeds. Of all writings in the world to-day none is so alive as the Holy Bible. Five hundred millions of the fifteen hundred millions of the human race, both no doubt rough estimates, are counted as Christians. And for Christians of all classes the Bible is living and authoritative. If the teachers of the Church are them-

selves persuaded, they can show out of this contemporary authority, which still so largely moulds our thought, that the sense of the word "Flesh" most fully applicable to the Christian hope of the future life is that which means "all things appertaining to the perfection of human nature." As the risen Christ declared Himself to be no mere spirit, so neither will be risen man.

(b) *The fault rather in the word "Resurrection."*

Second, re-collection of particles has certainly been taught in a way we cannot now admit; but the blame has been laid unfairly on one shoulder, whereas it should be distributed on two. And the greater weight should be on the other shoulder. For while it is easily possible to explain from Scripture that "Flesh" has several meanings, of which we may select the most appropriate, it is difficult to see what other sense can be given to "Resurrection" than "Rising again." We notice in St. John of Damascus, followed expressly on this point by St. Thomas Aquinas—and no theologians since their time have more strongly influenced the East and West respectively—that the stress in *Anastasis* and *Resurrectio* falls rather on that *ana* or *re* interpreted as *again*. Only that which has fallen can rise again, they say; the spirit has not fallen but the body; if the body is to rise *again*, it must be the same body. No doubt something is required to emphasize continuity between the mortal and the risen body. But continuity has been construed as complete identity. "A one-sided formulation may be true," says Whitehead, "but may have the effect of a lie by its distortion of emphasis." It is the emphasis on absolute identity which has caused so much unrest (*Religion in the Making*, iv.).

More relief probably would come by return to the old English rendering "Uprising," than by changing *flesh* to *body*. And there would be abundant Scriptural support for dropping that *re*, *again*. The verb *anistemi* is constantly used in the New Testament simply for rising or standing up. When St. Matthew rises up and follows Christ, when the angel bids St. Peter in prison to get up, it is the word of the Creed. St. Paul uses the noun *anastasis*, but the verb in 1 Cor. xv. for the raising of Christ and of man is not *anistemi*—with its *ana* so often taken as *again*—but *egeiro*, which is simply *raise*. While in St. John vi., where our Lord four times says, "I will raise him up at the last day," the verb is *anistemi*, but we translate it without any *again*. In the Gospels the noun is *anastasis*, but both verbs are used for the Rising, e.g., St. Matthew xvii. *egeiro*, in the parallel passage St. Mark vii. 9 *anistemi*. We could get the same deliverance from that *re* in the Vulgate. "He is

not here but is risen"; the verb is not *resurrexit* but *surrexit* (St. Luke xxiv. 6). "Uprising" would be no mistranslation of the ancient Greek, but *Body* would appear to be so. The usual translation of *Sarx* and *Caro* is not *body*.

As an instance of "Uprising" as a well-understood term for Resurrection, we may take a poem by William of Nassington, a pious lawyer of the City of York, written about the year 1400 (*Religious Pieces*, Early Eng. Texts).

"Wherefore Thy bodily Uprising
To us example is and tokening
That we shall rise all generally
At the day of doom in soul and body.
Then shall all that are found rightwise
Through Thine Uprising to bliss rise;
But they that live ill unto their ending
Get no part in Thine Uprising."

(c) *Reformers meant no change of belief by the word "Body."*

Third, there is this further to add concerning the alternatives in our Prayer Book. Reference to the *Bishops' Book* and the *King's Book* makes plain that our Reformers had no intention to change the sense of the Article. They had no idea of sublimating the accepted doctrine by introducing the word "Body." "Flesh or Body," they say. Later on, Bishop Pearson, *On the Creed*, for a long time the standard authority in our Church, whose work has constantly been reprinted from 1659 to our time, writes, "We, when we translate it *body*, understand no other body but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the soul." He points out that "our church hath already taken care" against "ambiguity" by retaining the true translation "*Flesh*" in the service of Baptism. The need for such care he enforces by quoting from one of St. Jerome's Epistles. S. Jerome speaks of those who "put *body* not *flesh*, so that the orthodox, hearing *body*, may think it means *flesh*, but that the heretic may understand by it *spirit*. This is their first little trick."

(d) *But Modernists do mean change.*

But, fourth, in our time there is abroad much the same undermining of the strength of the Christian hope as made the Fathers so jealous for the word "Flesh." Some even in our own Church are seeking to bring about what they call a "re-statement" of certain Articles in the Creed, and of this one among them; which re-statement is in fact the statement of a different doctrine. They do intend to change our thought of a future life. We may take for an example the essay in *Liberal Evan-*

gelicalism, by Dr. Barnes, now Bishop of Birmingham. He assumes without more ado that "the immortality of the soul" is the Christian's creed (p. 301). Shortly after, in the volume *Immortality* (1924), he accepts St. Paul's suggestion or "imagination" of "a spiritual body," as guarding "the value and reality of the individual life." "Yet, when personality is perfected, it seems natural to assume that time and individuality will alike be transcended" (p. 170). That is to say, using the terms "body," "spiritual body," we are to understand by them nothing more than the Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and even so, what is meant by immortality is not clear. It is against the poverty and indefiniteness of such hope that the word "Flesh" has stood as a constant protection.

(e) *Change which reacts on faith in Christ's Resurrection.*

Fifth, we find that this rather common disposition to substitute the immortality of the soul for the Christian hope is being used to shake our faith in the Resurrection of Christ. It is said very truly that Christians have always asserted the closest connection between Christ's Resurrection and ours "Christ, St. Paul taught, was the first to rise from the dead; but as He rose, so should all His followers." So writes Dr. Percy Gardner, President of the Modernist "Churchmen's Union," in *Evolution of Christian Doctrine*. But "it is far more consonant to modern thought to hold with St. Paul that the resurrection (of man) will be in a spiritual body, or to revert to the Greek doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. But if either of these views be held, the physical resurrection of the Saviour loses all force and value." "Spiritual body" to him evidently is something opposed to physical or material.

The Gospel narratives of the Lord's Resurrection in a body subject to sensible tests thus go by the board, and we are once more back in Gnosticism. St. Paul, in the same chapter in which he teaches of the "spiritual body," writes with the utmost vigour against the spiritualizing away of the Lord's Resurrection (1 Cor. xv.). He began that chapter with what appears to be an officially authorized statement of the evidence for the Resurrection of Christ, who had been "buried." And as Dr. Bernard (of Dublin) pointed out in his admirable article on the chapter in *Studia Sacra*, sight and hearing, no less than touch, are physical tests. The witnesses were "chosen," but that the Risen Lord appeared to "five hundred brethren at once" implies that His appearance did not require high mystical equipment in the percipients. Whatever matter may be, Dr. Gore, in *Can we then Believe?* and elsewhere, Dr. Streeter in *Immortality*, Dr. Bernard, Dr. Sparrow-Simpson, Dr. Relton,

in *Postulates of a Christian Philosophy*, all agree that the risen Body of the Lord, and of man, must be accounted material. Which means that matter has an abiding-place in the purpose of God.

(f) *And on the Christian doctrine of Sacraments.*

Sixth, the modern re-interpreters see clearly that the Christian doctrine of sacraments stands or falls with the view taken of Christ's Resurrection and ours. Dr. Gardner continues: "That the Apostles believed their Master to be with them in Spirit is certain, and without the working of that Spirit the whole history of Christianity becomes unintelligible. But the revival of the slain body of the Saviour does not in the least help that history." Belief in such revival "may still be necessary to those who take a materialist view of the Christian sacraments; but to force it upon those to whom it is a mere impediment, an outworn phase of belief, is incongruous." Elsewhere he calls the accepted Christian doctrine of sacraments "magical" and "superstitious." And Dr. Barnes does the same, and for the same reason.

The inner meaning of this whole movement is that there is an attempt to force what is called "Platonism" on the Christian Church as the explanation of the universe. Humbly following what I understand to be the reading of such Platonic scholars as Professors John Burnet and A. E. Taylor, I do not believe this "Platonism" is what Plato meant or taught.* But the *Phædo* and the *Republic* are commonly taken to give his doctrine of a real world of ideas of which this phenomenal world is a pale shadow. An account of this doctrine can be found in Dr. Inge's *Platonic Tradition in English Thought*. The Christian Church, on the contrary, has always from the first seen in the Resurrection of Christ and "of the Flesh" the refutation of this Greek, or, more truly, Oriental philosophy. In that same collection of essays on *Liberal Evangelicalism*, Dr. Burroughs, now Bishop of Ripon, in flat contradiction to Dr. Barnes, calls upon us to dare to be Hebrew and not try to be Greek.

CONCLUSION

We perceive, then, that, though to the Reformers, as to St. Thomas Aquinas, "flesh" and "body" in this connection meant the same thing, today these words "body" and

* "So long as they [students] are content to know something of the *Republic* and the earlier dialogues, Platonism must be a sealed book to them" (J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy*, Preface). A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work*, also tells us that it is to the later dialogues (if indeed there), and not to the earlier Socratic ones, that we are to look for Plato's own metaphysical doctrine.

"spiritual body" are being used in a way which overthrows not only the Christian estimate of man's nature and the hope of his Uprising in completeness of that nature, but also the Resurrection of Christ and the Christian Sacraments. Surely it is better to retain and explain the word "Flesh," which, as the Fathers proved in their like warfare, can by no means be resolved into "spirit"; whereas, as they found, and as we see today, the word "body" can.

For, if we wanted more proof of the way "body" can be abused, we could get it from the Theosophists. Mrs. Besant in *Man and His Bodies* (Theos. Manuals, vii.) discourses on the physical body, astral body, mind body, temporary body, human aura, causal body. "Body" is not a safe word.

Lamentation over spilt milk serves no very useful purpose. Except that it may warn someone else, carrying a like pitcher down the same path, to be careful of what he does.

J. O. NASH, C.R.,
Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown.

THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA—I.*

I.—INTRODUCTORY

It is an historical study of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius that I have undertaken to attempt; and it is natural to remark at the outset that the Spiritual Exercises have played a momentous part in religious history, from the moment of their conception down to the present time. The Spiritual Exercises furnished, perhaps, the chief weapon of the Counter-Reform. The truly great figures of history are those of men who have set no less store upon the past than upon the future; they are like the mighty trees that dig their roots deeper into the ground the further they spread their branches above. An Augustus builds an empire upon forms republican, where the reckless methods of a Julius Cæsar have ended in murder. None more ardent, therefore, in defence of the old order than Ignatius; yet none, perhaps, reacted upon it with greater and more lasting effect. The very magnitude of the result is apt to obscure the bold originality of his methods, since the thoughtless may look for his special contribution rather in what is still peculiar to his order than in what has come to be part and parcel (so to

* Being a paper read before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.

speak) of the common stock. This is particularly true of the Spiritual Exercises; built upon truths accepted by all Catholics, they yet applied those truths with such overwhelming force that the demand grew with the increasing fruit, and the whole systematic work of retreats such as it is to-day may be traced back in no small measure to the cave of Manresa.

Few have helped to bring out clearly both the early and the modern success of the Exercises more than the present Pope, quite apart from his administrative action. In a study which he wrote before his pontificate upon St. Charles Borromeo's use and esteem of the Exercises,* he thus summed up both the saint's opinion of the Exercises and his own:

"For the rest, it was very natural, not to say happily inevitable, that it should be thus. A book such as that of the *Exercises of St Ignatius*, which almost at once asserted and imposed itself as the wisest and most universal code of the spiritual direction of souls, as an inexhaustible source of the profoundest and at the same time of the solidest piety, as an irresistible stimulus and securest guide to conversion and to the highest spirituality and perfection; such a book could not but find a place in the front rank among the favourite books of our saint (St. Charles), whose characteristic genius and most noble aspirations, and in a word his whole spirit, it so well reflected."

To this study the Pope refers in his Apostolic Constitution of July 25, 1922, constituting St. Ignatius the patron "of all Spiritual Exercises, and therefore of the institutes, sodalities, and societies of whatever kind, which give their labour and zeal to those who make Spiritual Exercises." This pronouncement seems to make a consideration of the Exercises opportune at the present time; and there are other reasons which further justify it, chief among them the recent publication of certain relevant works. The literature and bibliography of the Exercises is enormous and increasing, and I will not attempt to grapple with it; but no work relevant to the subject can compare for one moment in importance with the critical edition of the Exercises, and of all early documents bearing upon them, in the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu* (hereafter quoted as *M.H.*). The volume appeared in 1919, at Madrid. The series is a vast one, running already to about sixty volumes, and still in progress; it is edited by Spanish Fathers of the Society (the early documents being largely Spanish), and contains all extant documents bearing on the early history of the Society, including, for example, the large correspondence of St. Ignatius himself. The evidence is there for the seeker after historical truth. To

* *San Carlo e gli Esercizi spirituali di Sant' Ignazio*: reprinted with a French translation in the *Collection de la Bibliothèque des Exercices* (published at Enghien in Belgium) for March, 1911.

the edition of the Exercises I shall upon occasion return; this paper owes much to it. It is concerned, however, rather with the lower and higher criticism of the Exercises, than with what I may call the spiritual interpretation.

Another important work deserving especial mention is l'Abbé Pourrat's *Spiritualité Chrétienne*. The first two volumes have been translated into English, but not yet the first part of the third, which deals chiefly with St. Ignatius, St. Teresa, and St. Francis of Sales; the author, I regret to say, has recently died, so that we cannot hope to see the work completed by himself. It is a survey of the whole history of spiritual *doctrine* (not practice) within the Church, of enormous importance historically and for those who would not willingly exclude what finds a legitimate place within the Catholic point of view. True, some are dissatisfied at the treatment of their own particular saint; nevertheless, this is a pioneer work of great merit, upon which later students will profitably build.

Another work deserving a brief notice, though not directly connected with the Exercises, is *Grâces d'Oraison* (English translation, *Graces of Interior Prayer*), by Père Poulain, S.J., now also dead. The result of forty years' study of the spiritual experiences of the saints, it contains at the end of each chapter extracts from their writings justifying the principles laid down in the text. Although it has been the subject of some controversy, the points in dispute do not appear in the main to be of great significance; and it is so solidly built upon the evidence, that it should be cited as helping to make of the present time a new epoch in the analysis of spiritual experience. Various other French books might be added, such as Père Brou's *Saint Ignace, maître d'oraison* (Paris, 1925), and some previous works of his connected with the Exercises.

Two noteworthy contributions from England may close this brief list. In 1915 Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., published the full Spanish text, with an English translation and copious commentary. This important work was followed in 1919 by a translation of the Exercises and of the official Directory, with notes upon the former, the whole by Father Longridge, of the Cowley Fathers at Oxford, a *pulcherrimum opus*, as the Editors of the *Monumenta* fitly term it (*M.H.*, p. 1275).

A last introductory word upon the language of the Exercises. They were written originally in Castilian, which may be called the saint's own language, although it is very likely (*M.H.*, p. 179) that he knew Basque also, and perhaps some elements of other languages. To the Basque nation he himself appears to have belonged, like St. Francis Xavier; and even today for the most ardent devotion of St. Ignatius it is to the Basques of his

own country that we must go. Very rarely we have some technical phrases or reminiscences of scholastic Latin (*M.H.*, p. 48). There is little of literary grace in the saint's Spanish. There is much, indeed, that is dry and technical, where we might expect some vehement outburst; a useful reminder, perhaps, of the nature of the work, which is not intended to produce any immediate effect upon the reader, but is merely a guide and manual for the director of the retreat. Yet now and again we have some striking, pregnant phrase which means volumes for those who can fathom its significance.

II.—IGNATIAN SPIRITUALITY

It is hardly possible (I think) to treat satisfactorily of the Spiritual Exercises without first setting forth certain larger aspects of Ignatian spirituality which underlie them. Even small details of a work may acquire a new significance when viewed in relation to the whole attitude and mentality of its author; and so it is certainly with the Spiritual Exercises.

Confining myself, as I must, to the larger lines of historical interpretation, I find it chiefly necessary to insist that in order to behold the spirit of the Exercises writ large and plain, one must turn to the religious order which Ignatius founded, the Society of Jesus. Not, of course, that the finished product of the Exercises is of necessity a Jesuit; such a thought was far from Ignatius' mind. Speaking broadly, we may say that the Spiritual Exercises contain nothing that every Catholic must not admit to be right, whether proposed by way of absolute duty or by way of counsel and more perfect life; whereas Ignatius' Order represents a body which he judged it for the greater glory of God to found in order to meet certain crying needs in the Church, but which was not intended to destroy anything already existing. It was intended far more to help to infuse everywhere new life, so far as was possible; and in this it was largely successful. Still, it will easily be understood that in legislating for the body founded by himself, Ignatius, if I may put it that way, let himself go, and pushed to the extreme the concrete practice of principles merely indicated generally in the Exercises. This fact could be profusely illustrated; but I find I must compress my paper if I am to include even the more essential points. I must therefore be content to remark that the Constitutions of the Society, framed by Ignatius, contain within themselves an implicit interpretation and application of the Exercises; and that the principles of the Exercises are recognized by the Society to be part and parcel of its true spirit and very essence.

Accordingly, the three points upon which alone I must be content to lay stress are evidently common to the Exercises with the Society. The first of these I am tempted to sum up in the words "Back to Christ." All the saints are necessarily conspicuous for their love of Christ, an essential feature of all sanctity; but Ignatius is one of the very few so outstanding in this respect as to make it a true characteristic in him. I venture to compare him in this regard to St. Paul and to St. Francis of Assisi. There is a certain paradox in the history of Christian spirituality; it seems to start so far away from Christ, and then to draw ever nearer. It is almost with a gasp of astonishment that we find the Church celebrating a St. Paul (of all names!) as the first of her hermits! Truth to say, all the fulness of Christ's life and teaching cannot be found in a single man or institution; and with her great Catholic heart she would not quench the spirit there, where she found much divine truth and no error. From the hermits we come to the monks, living in the main a life of the direct worship of God, not aiming of set purpose at apostolic work for neighbour. The apostolic ideal may be said to enter into the practice of religious perfection with the friars; and therewith enters a life resembling more closely the life of Christ, or the life of a Paul. The charm of a Francis lies, surely, in his embodiment within himself of Christ, in all Christ's manner of life and teaching, and that, as he would have said, without gloss. It is the Sermon on the Mount pure and simple, lived and preached.

Ignatius, careful organizer, did not follow Francis to the end of his pursuit of poverty. Christ, the God-man, needed no teaching or training, but we poor mortals need much of both if we are to stand for His knowledge and His sanctity. Ignatius therefore wished the actual training of the members of the Order—a unique training upon which he laid great stress—to be sufficiently provided for without need of begging. But in some other respects he went further than Francis, omitting much that had hitherto been thought essential to religious Orders, such as the singing of the divine office and the fixed habit. Each province of the Society takes the habit it finds convenient; that common (though with a slight divergence) to the English and Irish provinces is peculiar to them, though it bears an obvious family likeness to the M.A. gown at Oxford. Love for Christ took Ignatius, like Francis, to Palestine; his followers, like Christ Himself, were to be ready to go anywhere and everywhere doing good, trusting for their support in virtue not to temple or synagogue, but to private prayer to their Father, in room or on mountain, of which no work or mission or other circumstance could deprive them. Such an ideal raised diffi-

culties, and that not least at a time when some were speaking of abolishing all the religious Orders already existing, as being past cure; but Ignatius went further still, and by tenacious effort succeeded in obtaining for his Order the name of Christ Himself. The word "Society," however, should in reality be "Company," as indeed it is in some other languages, and even to some extent in English usage; Ignatius allowed *Societas* and *Socii* to pass, but the true rendering of his thought would have been *Cohors* and *commilitones*. If the Society has gratefully accepted the large place in the devotion to the Sacred Heart assigned to it in the revelations of St. Margaret Mary, the especial value which this privilege possesses for it is that of a divine consecration of its own particular spirit of personal devotion to our Lord. It is the human experience of Christ, if I may reverently put it that way, which it would fain make the religious experience of its own members also. "Let that mind be in you," says the Apostle, "which was also in Christ Jesus" (Philip. ii. 5).

In the light of what I have said, it will easily be understood that the Exercises fall in with the general movement in the Counter-Reform (duly noted by Pourrat) towards internal, as against external, piety. The pomp and circumstance of religious worship had not availed to stay the cataclysm, and in any case were often no longer feasible. More emphasis was laid upon prayer and private meditation. The lesson of St. Paul came home in a fully Catholic sense, that faith, to use the words of the Council of Trent (Sess. VI., chap. viii.), is the foundation and root of all justification, that all depends upon the inward disposition, the depth and efficacy of that faith, rather than upon any external functions, which, except as the outcome of that faith, could have no value. Greater safety was thus secured in a more hostile world; and in the light of the past a renewed emphasis was laid upon poverty and the danger of riches. Where the whole world seemed to need reconquest, apostolic zeal was sure to reject all bounds and limits, and in Francis Xavier, greatest perhaps of St. Ignatius' companions, the Church has recognized (I think I may say) the greatest of her foreign missionaries, so that the Holy See has appointed him patron of the Society and work for the Propagation of the Faith. These various traits in the spirituality of the Counter-Reform are reflected in the Exercises; they are part of a general spirit produced by the times, though doubtless reinforced by the Exercises themselves, as by other Catholic reaction.

Having thus spoken of what I have termed the movement "Back to Christ," and also of the tendencies of the Counter-Reform, I must add in the third place that Ignatius belonged to

the Spanish School. I was glad to see how explicitly Pourrat recognizes that with the national principle emerging in fact and principle, there emerged also national spirituality, so that the three great Catholic nations, Spain, Italy and France, should be considered as so many separate schools, in spite of the strong influences cutting across such a division. In Spain we have an outburst of saints without parallel in history: St. Ignatius himself, with St. Francis Xavier and St. Francis Borgia of his Order: but also St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, St. Peter of Alcantara, Blessed John of Avila and other saints, several of whom knew and esteemed each other. Both St. Francis Borgia and St. Peter of Alcantara reassured St. Teresa by proving to her that it was possible to combine the active with the contemplative life, as she was compelled to do herself. The study of interior states is common (I believe) to the whole Spanish school, being due in part to the fear of the delusions of the *Illuminati*, or of the Inquisition on the quest of *Illuminati*. Ignatius, however, distinguishes himself even in the Spanish school for his strong Spanish chivalry, which gives a personal trait to his otherwise very objective spirituality. Francis, also, I may observe, was in strong sympathy with true chivalry, but this can hardly be called (as with Ignatius) one of the dominating ideas of his life-work. If Ignatius' order is the "Company of Jesus," in the Exercises also Christ is the crusading King, beneath whose banner none but a caitiff will refuse to serve. Is the age of chivalry dead? Nothing has been so surprising as the tremendous success of the "Knights of the Blessed Sacrament" movement, but lately started in this country; and I do not think that I can be wrong in tracing back to Ignatius much of the inspiration for the feast of "Christ the King," only lately instituted by the present Pope.

III.—ORIGIN OF THE EXERCISES

Ignatius was wounded at the siege of Pampeluna in A.D. 1521, and it was during his recovery from the wound, and from the operations whereby he hoped to escape the resulting deformity, that he was converted from a life never perhaps very wicked, but full of chivalrous ardour for military prowess and glory, to a very high sanctity, strong enough, as I have already indicated, to enrol that same chivalrous ardour, with all that was noblest in it, beneath the banner of Christ. Nature was not to be annihilated, but was to be roused to sublime effort by the vision of a diviner warfare. In the following year, A.D. 1522, he visited the Benedictine abbey of Montserrat, and after a short stay retired to the cave at Manresa, itself not far from

Montserrat, which he continued to visit from time to time. In A.D. 1523 he made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but not being allowed to stay there, he returned in 1524 to Barcelona, where he learnt Latin among the schoolboys, so that in 1526 he was able to begin the study of philosophy at Alcalá. There he gave the Exercises; the following year at Salamanca, when put into prison, he handed them over to his judges for inspection (*M.H.*, p. 29). They were already therefore complete in substance, though he continued to touch them up and add to them long afterwards, perhaps indeed till his death.

Nevertheless, the tradition stands firm, attested by those who knew him well, that he composed the substance of the Spiritual Exercises at Manresa itself. Here we are faced by two divergent views regarding the possible debt of Ignatius to a previous work. In 1493 Father García Ximénez de Cisneros, relative to the celebrated Cardinal Francis Ximénez de Cisneros, was elected Abbot of Montserrat, where he died in 1510. He was conspicuous for his holiness, and in 1500 brought out an *Exercitatorium vitæ spiritualis*, "an Exercising in the spiritual life," which had an immediate and striking success throughout the Benedictine Order, and even beyond it. In particular, it was used to help those who made pilgrimages to Montserrat, of whom Ignatius (as has been said) was one. Indeed, we may treat it as practically an agreed point that Ignatius read the work, since the editors of the *Monumenta Historica* (*M.H.* p. 121) themselves consider this very probable. They examine the relation between the Exercises and the *Exercitatorium* at great length, printing in full all relevant passages; and finally they come to the conclusion that Ignatius' debt to the *Exercitatorium* is quite negligible (*M.H.*, p. 121). Their argument, however, based upon a minute comparison of supposed parallels, does not altogether convince me, for the debt (if debt there be) is to be found rather in certain larger features, such as the very title of "Spiritual Exercises," the use of "weeks" answering to the purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways, which "weeks" may be lengthened or contracted as may be found expedient, and again, certain details in the method of meditation. On the other hand, I cannot feel that full justice has been done to the tremendous originality of the Spiritual Exercises, either by Pourrat or by Dom John Besse, O.S.B., in his well-known article in the *Revue des Questions historiques* (*L'Exercice de Garcia de Cisneros et les Exercices de saint Ignace*, vol. lxi., 1897), this latter praised by the *Monumenta* editors themselves as learned, wise, and moderate (*M.H.*, p. 104). At the most the *Exercitatorium* may have given Ignatius a few very general ideas, a kind of framework calling not only

for skilled execution, but also for the conception of those patterns which would represent the most characteristic features of the Exercises.

Ignatius, indeed, was chiefly conscious of another kind of teaching at Manresa. It was for him a time of great spiritual illumination. God Himself, he said at a later time, had been his schoolmaster, perhaps because he had no one else to teach him (*M.H.*, pp. 35, 38). He spoke also later of a light once received from God at Manresa regarding spiritual things, and matters of faith and knowledge, upon a number of particular points; a light so great that all the help he had received from God, and all that he had learnt up to his then age of sixty-two, did not appear to him to equal what he had experienced at that one time (*M.H.*, p. 36; Pourrat, II., pp. 44-45). I have not found a passage recorded in which Ignatius directly asserts that he received divine help in the immediate composition of the Exercises themselves; some, however, who knew him well (such as Father Polancus, his secretary) do assert this, and his own strong and persevering belief in the Exercises tends to confirm it.

I trust that I need not apologize very profusely for this mention of divine illuminations; Ignatius' life at Manresa (as I have sufficiently indicated) was such that it is impossible to discuss seriously the origin of the Exercises without such mention. In our own time we no longer suffer so much from the coarse materialism that was powerful in the latter half of the last century, and the intercourse of spirit with spirit—even with the spirits of the dead—is more readily admitted to be possible. Certainly the Catholic Church admits the possibility of intercourse with good and evil spirits and with the dead, though naturally she considers that a man should be careful about the company he keeps, even in the matter of spirits. Still more naturally, however, she considers that Almighty God Himself is most able to make Himself known and understood. Intercourse with God and the world of spirits is an experience which pervades her whole history, as it pervades the whole of biblical history likewise.

Nevertheless, as I have said, Ignatius did not leave the Exercises such as he had first written them. It is, indeed, a question whether he ever finally took his hand off them. Hence, although the evidence for the text is abundant and convincing, we are left in some doubt as to various small details; the *Monumenta* editors, in fact, consider that several Spanish copies of the Exercises were in this way revised by Ignatius at various times. What is now called the *Autograph* is in fact such a copy; it was not written by St. Ignatius, but was revised by him from

beginning to end, with many alterations. This is the most important witness for the text. What is called the Vulgate text is the Latin translation made by Frusius with a view to approbation by the Holy See, which it received in 1548. There was an awkward mistake, however, in the rendering of the fourteenth rule for thinking with the Church; Fr. Frusius made it appear a mere possibility, instead of certain fact, that salvation is only for the predestined. Some exception was taken to this—and quite rightly so, yet a foretaste of mightier controversies to follow; Ignatius was averse to correcting a version already approved by the Holy See, but this was done not long after his death. Another early and important Latin translation, the *Versio prima*, was composed, the Editors infer, by one who thought rather in Spanish, so that the Spanish shows through; they are inclined to attribute it to Ignatius himself.

It is an interesting fact that the earliest surviving copy of the Exercises comes from the hand of an Englishman, a graduate of this university. His name was John Helyar; he was a secular priest exiled for conscience' sake under Henry VIII., and appears to have made the Exercises under Ignatius himself in 1534 at Paris. Helyar's manuscript, as is clear from various allusions to contemporary events, cannot have been written before 1534 or after 1537. The chief use he made of this paper volume was for renderings from the Greek Fathers into Latin, and he puts down various jottings, laments upon events in England, the payment of five (pence or shillings?) for "bloodloting," a complaint about his pen—perhaps he is trying another when he writes that "John . . . is a good fellow." Much is omitted from the Exercises, and there are changes made in the order; but the chief interest is in two or three additions to the text, such as that found at the opening of the meditation of the Two Standards, where it is said (to put it briefly) that Christ promises nothing pleasant here below, but in the future all things most delightful, whereas Satan promises pleasure here below, but "conducts men incontinently into an eternal banishment." The Editors are not inclined to attribute weight to Helyar's additions, but Father Thurston* thinks that they may go back to St. Ignatius, a view which would tend to enhance greatly the value of Helyar's text, as offering us by far the earliest stage of the Exercises.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

(To be concluded.)

* *The Month*, October, 1923, vol. 142, p. 336 ff.; *The First Englishman to make the Spiritual Exercises*.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor will be absent from home during the first fortnight of September, and would be glad to be spared any correspondence in connexion with THEOLOGY during that time.

We have received from Dr. Yngwe Brilioth, for review, a copy of a large volume entitled *Nattvarden*; and we should be glad to be put into communication with any student of Eucharistic theology and liturgies who is familiar with Swedish. Our efforts in this direction have so far proved fruitless; but we are sure that all who know Dr. Brilioth's work would wish to be put *au fait* with this his latest volume.

We have received two copies of "Penny Pamphlets for Irish Churchmen" dealing respectively with Confirmation and Conversion. The treatment of both subjects seems to us excellent, and we wish the series every success. We have also received a copy of the revised edition of the Rev. F. M. Downton's *Rhymed Instructions on the Our Father*, to which we extended a cordial welcome when it appeared. This second edition embodies several improvements, and we believe that it will prove invaluable in Schools and Sunday Schools. Copies are to be had of A. V. Gibbs and Son, Newbury Street, Wantage. The price is 3d. a copy, with special terms for quantities from the publishers.

Among contributors to the present issue, Mr. W. Cannon is well known for his scholarly interpretations of *The Song of Solomon* and *Psalm lxxviii.*, and other Old Testament studies. The Rev. H. Lovell Clarke is Vicar of Armley, Leeds; and Father Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., is on the staff of Heythrop College, Chipping Norton.

A correspondent writes to draw attention, apropos of the Rev. J. V. Bullard's article in our last issue, to the important contribution made to the subject by the Rev. A. Ogle, in his *Canon Law in Mediæval England*, published in 1912.

NOTES

1. THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

THE inclusion of this Epistle in the Canon needs no defence in modern times: it is so richly human, so humanly attractive—*menschlich reizvoll* (Dibelius): it gives such a portrait of St. Paul as the courteous gentleman "forbearing his own advantage"; such a representation of a local church as an affectionate brotherhood—the words ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή, occur five times in it, applied alike to master, to mistress, and to slave: it breathes such a spirit of forgiveness that we turn back to it again and again with

delight and gratitude. But this was not always so: Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodore bear witness to the depreciation of it, the doubt which many felt about its inspiration, in their days, and Theodore has a long defence of it, as showing due respect for the different grades in a household, the master first, then the mistress, then the son, then the household, as illustrating the true method of setting others right, and St. Paul's humility and care for slaves. St. Chrysostom similarly draws morals from it, that we must not abandon slaves, however wicked, that we must not withdraw slaves from the service of their masters, that we must not be ashamed of our servants if they are virtuous, that even in small matters we must take pains, and he implies that there are many other lessons to be learnt from a study of it. Yet neither of them lays stress upon doctrinal truth to be drawn from it, and that was probably the ground for the depreciation of it and the doubt whether it had been rightly treated as Canonical.

Now I wish to suggest that this hesitation has been partly due to the fact that in all MSS. and in nearly all early lists of the Canonical Books it has been placed in its wrong order. Being a private letter it has been placed with the Pastoral Epistles; being the shortest letter it has been placed at the end. What is its proper place? Clearly between Colossians and Ephesians. Everyone would agree that it had been written at the same time, probably on the same day, as the Epistle to the Colossians: they are both written from prison; Onesimus is mentioned in Col. iv. 9; greetings are sent by the same friends.* All who regard "Ephesians" as written by St. Paul would agree that that letter was written shortly after "Colossians."

Now one central thought of "Colossians" is that it was "the good pleasure of the Father . . . through Christ to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of the Cross . . . all things, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens" (i. 19, 20). One central thought of "Ephesians" is that Christ has broken down the barrier between Jew and Gentile, so making peace, reconciling both in one body unto God through the Cross (ii. 14, 16). May not these great truths in his mind have worked, whether consciously or unconsciously, upon St. Paul's action? Would it not be possible (he might ask himself) for him to help in this reconciling work, to carry on Christ's work in the human sphere? Ought not he to send back Onesimus to his true master? Ought not he himself to bear the cost, to make up what Philemon had lost by Onesimus' wrong-doing, even as Christ had given his whole life as a *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*? I should not wish to assert that all this was consciously present to St. Paul's mind: I should prefer to think that it worked far more unconsciously: that, as sometimes when we have dwelt in meditation on some Christian doctrine or virtue we find ourselves doing or saying, in the course of the day, almost instinctively and without conscious effort, some thing or some word which illustrates that virtue, so I should like to think that it was of this action. In either alternative, if the Epistle does not add any new doctrinal teaching, it does add testimony to the effect of doctrine upon the life, to the power of a great truth to reproduce itself in a believer's acts. The reconciled has become himself a

* There are six friends mentioned in Col. iv. 10-14; only five in Phil. 23, 24. "Jesus who is called Justus" is omitted. Deissmann has ingeniously suggested that *Ἰησοῦς* may have accidentally fallen out after *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, or that we ought to read *ἐν Χριστῷ, Ἰησοῦς*.

reconciler. It is noteworthy in this connection that it is in the "Ephesians" that St. Paul has the strongest expression of the duty of Christians being imitators of the Divine character, "forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you. Be ye therefore imitators of God" (iv. 32, v. 1).

If I am right so far, I think it has a bearing on the interpretation of one word in the Epistle, the word *πρεσβύτης* in verse 9. All older commentators interpreted this as "an aged man," "senior," and so in his recent Commentary still does M. Dibelius, but Bentley and other critics independently have conjectured that it was either a scribe's mistake for *πρεσβεύτης* or that it had become a variant form of *πρεσβεύτης*, and in either case ought to be translated "an ambassador." Now if we place side by side with it the phrase in Eph. vi. 20, written soon afterwards, *ὑπερ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἄλυσει*, "the Gospel for which I am an ambassador in chains," and add to this 2 Cor. v. 20, 21, *ὑπερ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος* (the same word as in verse 10) *δί ἡμῶν· δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ*, it seems to me almost conclusive that the words *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* qualify both words, and the meaning is "being such a one as Paul, always an ambassador of Jesus Christ, but now also a prisoner for his sake." The appeal to his age would indeed be natural, but not so appropriate to his special purpose at the moment.

One other thought is perhaps worth mentioning. Is it not possible that the circumstances of Onesimus have had a reflex action upon the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians? In these, for the first time, St. Paul formulates his rules for family life. In Ephesians this is elaborated by dwelling on the analogy between the family and the Church: in Colossians the thought is only of the family in itself, and it is noticeable that in it the fullest rules are laid down for the spirit in which slaves are to do their duty to their masters. St. Paul is willing to plead for, to spend his money to help, to procure the reconciliation of Onesimus to his master: but there ought to be no such Onesimus in a Christian Church.

W. LOCK.

2. THE EXCEPTING CLAUSE IN ST MATTHEW

With considerable hesitation I join in the discussion of the famous exception in Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. The proposed solution of the problem is so simple and can be stated so shortly that I venture to put it forward, though I realize that simplicity is generally attained in such matters by neglecting important elements of the problem.

Disregarding the Hebrew which lies behind the phrase, let us ask what *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, "except for cause of—," would have meant in the period A.D. 60-80 in the Church of Antioch, which may well have been the place of origin of the First Gospel. *πορνεία* cannot have meant infidelity within the realm of marriage, for in Matt. xv. 19 it is distinguished from *μοιχεία*. For St. Matthew infidelity between betrothal and marriage would have been adultery (*μοιχεία*), see i. 19. Unchaste conduct on the part of a maiden before her betrothal at 14 or 15 is very unlikely. We must look therefore for some other form of sexual impropriety.

Two passages throw light on the word. In 1 Cor. v. 1 St. Paul denounces a heinous form of *πορνεία*, a man's marrying his father's widow.

(The link between the woman and the father may have been slight in Christian eyes, perhaps an irregular secondary union, and the "liberty"-loving Corinthian Christians thought it could be disregarded "in the Lord.")

The Apostolic Decree of Acts xv. 29 promulgated a compromise by which Gentiles and Jews could share a common social life, and with it the Eucharist: the Jews were not to demand circumcision or the ceremonial law; the Gentiles were to abstain from meat sold at the butcher's which had played its part at a sacrifice, from meat at the killing of which the blood had not been properly drained, from "black-puddings" and other repellent ways of using the blood, and from "fornication" (*πορνείας*). The "Western Text" and interpretation, by which the Gentiles are to abstain from idolatry, murder and fornication, are surely inconceivable—the discussion was on a higher level than that. But they naturally arose, with the dropping out of "things strangled," when the Church had outgrown a purely local and temporary compromise, forgetting even that it had ever existed. Notice that the decree was read with joy at Antioch (xv. 31); it was taken to the Churches of the First Journey (xvi. 4). It seems to have reached the Province of Asia (Rev. ii. 14). In Corinth St. Paul felt at liberty to urge its food regulations on the ground of charity only (1 Cor. viii). Since the first three articles of the compromise are concerned with practices which were abhorrent to the Jews but seemed innocent enough to the Gentiles, the fourth must be of a similar nature. The passage in 1 Corinthians gives us the clue. *πορνεία* here means *marriage within the prohibited Levitical degrees*. In this matter Gentile Christianity wholly adopted Jewish standards, and the decree became obsolete because there was no longer any difference of opinion. But for a decade or two, especially in places like Antioch, where Jew and Gentile met and where the agitation culminating in the decree arose, *marriage within the prohibited degrees* was a live issue, and *πορνεία* was the word by which it was known.

Turning to St Matthew, the problem we have to account for is the obscuring of the plain rule of St Mark by an exception which seems inconsistent with the teaching of Our Lord even in St Matthew. If the foregoing argument holds, the reference is to the local Syrian problem. One exception is allowed to the universal rule: when a man who has married within the prohibited degrees puts away his wife the word adultery is out of place. Rather the marriage is null. The tradition represented in the First Gospel rightly put the exception on Our Lord's lips. He was dealing with Jewish conditions—the development of His teaching to fit Gentile problems was a legitimate extension of it.

If this solution is correct, the famous excepting clause, so far from being a flaw in the Church's case, strengthens it. There is no divorce, but causes of nullity may be recognized.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

[Dr. Lowther Clarke's suggestion is certainly attractive; and, though it depends on an unusual interpretation of the Apostolic decree, it has the advantage of throwing light on that no less than on the excepting clause. Since the appearance of my article last month, a friend has reminded me of the late Bishop Chase's *What did Christ teach about Divorce?* (1921). Though agreeing (as I should do) with Canon Charles that *πορνεία* was used in N.T. times to cover sexual unchastity generally, Bishop Chase

points out that in the two Matthæan passages the context absolutely required the specific term *μοιχεία*, if "adultery" were meant. And the Bishop goes on to urge, as I did, that the allusion in the excepting clause is to pre-nuptial unchastity; though unfortunately he does not stand by the consequences of this interpretation when he comes to sum up his argument.

As against this interpretation it is argued that, on the Jewish view of betrothal, a bride's unchastity before marriage would naturally be called *μοιχεία* rather than *πορνεία*: to which it may be replied that (i.) *μοιχεία* is not used in this connexion in the LXX of Deut. xxii. 13-21, but *ἐκπορνεῦσαι*; (ii.) the important thing is the meaning of either word for the Church, probably at Antioch, for which St. Matthew wrote; and it is reasonably certain that they would not have regarded pre-nuptial unchastity as *μοιχεία*, but as *πορνεία*.

It is instructive to note that Dr. Lowther Clarke no less than Bishop Chase agrees with the view that the excepting clause does not refer to adultery after marriage. And, as Dr. Lowther Clarke says, our Lord must be understood as teaching that in the case covered by the exception the marriage was not dissoluble but *null*.—E. G. S.]

3. A TRIBUTE TO ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX

A Congress of the Association Bourguignonne des Sociétés Savantes opened at Dijon, on Sunday, June 12 last, under the presidency of M. Hanotaux of the Académie Française. High Mass was sung in the Cathedral at half-past nine, to the *Missa Brevis* of Palestrina, the celebrant being the Abbot of Cîteaux, and the preacher Dom Anselme le Bail, Abbot of the Trappist monastery of Scourmont in Belgium.

It was an unusual thing for the Cistercian Rite to be seen outside a church of the Order. Vespers were sung, *en faux-bourdon*, at three o'clock, and the singing of the famous *maîtrise* of S. Bénigne, under the direction of Monseigneur Moissenet, was an inspiring presentation of the ecclesiastical chant, no less than had been the *Missa Brevis*, in the dignified counterpoint of the *Musicæ Princeps*, a treat to English ears.

In the evening the Congressists were invited visitors at a mystery play, adapted by M. Estaunié, of the Académie Française, and bearing the arresting title "Le Chevalier quia donné sa femme au dyable." Here, again, came a touch of Palestrina, for the play was preceded by the well-known "L'homme armé," which the master used as a theme for one of his masses. The distinguished Academician, whose Burgundian *romans* are so familiar to French readers, is to be congratulated upon the skill with which he re-created for us the mediæval atmosphere of the mystery play. Such re-creation, taken with the religious offices of the earlier part of the day, served well to introduce the Congressists to the *milieu* in which the great Burgundian saint, philosopher, and prophet, whose memory so many had assembled to venerate, lived, and by his life served his day and generation.

Almost at the moment of the Congress opportunely appeared, from the publishing house of Flammarion, M. Georges Goyau's book on St. Bernard, a book the severe objectivity of which, combined with its religious sympathy, is sure to secure for it the attention of students of the Saint's career. Amongst the Congressists were to be recognized M. Joseph Bédier, of the Académie Française, M. Emile Mâle, of the

Institute, and M. Lasserre, author of *Le Secret d'Abélard*. The lecture, given by this last writer, of the nature of a debate between St. Bernard and his great opponent, was something of a *tour de force*. M. Lasserre seemed to find the explanation of the antipathy between the two protagonists in racial characteristics; when one remembers that Abélard was a Breton, as were Châteaubriand, Lamennais, and Renan, one possesses the key. The suggestion is attractive, but scarcely convincing.

M. Oursel, the librarian of Dijon, read a most interesting paper upon the Bernardine *incunabula* at the British Museum, "*La vie de Monseigneur saint Bernard*." It is a black letter of the early sixteenth century, bearing neither date nor imprint. The British Museum catalogue suggests 1505 and Lyons. It is practically the *Vita Prima*, but the name of the writer of the second book is given as Bernard, not as Arnald.

By the courtesy of the Keeper of the Printed Books the title-page, a striking piece of work, and the colophon were photographed for M. Oursel's use. The latter is of the opinion that the book was printed at Dijon.

It is to be regretted that, for family reasons, Dr. Coulton, our distinguished English mediævalist, was unable to be present, but his paper, *S. Bernard, Guerrier de Dieu*, was read for him. The burden of Dr. Coulton's message was in some considerable degree in accord with that of Captain Charrier's contribution on *Le Sens Militaire de S. Bernard*. The son of the Seigneur de Fontaines was always a soldier, a *miles Christi*; he comported himself as the squire of One who came to bring not peace but a sword; he was ever prompt to take the offensive.

Unfortunately Professor Prentout of Caen was unable to read his paper upon the Cistercians in Normandy and in England. It would have been a pleasure to have heard him tell the story of Waverley, our premier Cistercian foundation, and of Tintern, and of the feeler put out far west, when at Mellifont, in the diocese of Armagh, the first Cistercian footstep was planted in Ireland; to say nothing of Savigny and of Furness, and of the latter's claim to English premiership.

In truth the Congress was a great day for the Cistercians. There were present, besides Dom Jean Baptiste Olitraut de Kéryvallan, the Abbot-General, and the Abbot of Cîteaux, the *Caput Ordinis*, abbots from Savoy, Hungary, Austria, Belgium, England, and Ireland. The *entente* was cordial beyond words; the English representative from Oxford received particular attention, the absence of Dr. Coulton, the Cambridge representative, being much regretted. Professor Conant from Harvard University was touched by the kindness shown him. There was scarcely an abbot who failed to exchange cards with the writer and to beg him to visit his abbey.

The influence of the saintly Bernard of Clairvaux seemed to be felt in our midst, the influence of a *pacifator mundi*.

Dijon was proud of its literary treasures: its Psalter of Robert of Molesme; its famous Bible of St. Stephen Harding, the Englishman who learned his scholarship at Sherborne; its early Cistercian formularies; its *Charta Charitatis*, also the work of St. Stephen; its fine copy of Manriquez's *Annals*; its ponderous inventory of the library of Cîteaux, compiled by Abbot Jean de Cirey in 1480; and most admirably were they displayed and most courteously were they explained by M. Oursel. Perhaps what struck one most of all was the interest and enthusiasm of the laity of all nationalities, denominations, and classes; of academicians, Danish Lutherans, officers of the army, Anglican clergymen; of the

Secretary of the Congress not least, General Duplessis, the fine old soldier who fought beside the London Brigade on the Marne and was afterwards Military Governor of the Côte d'Or. So far as the present writer is concerned, no one more cordially appreciated his humble contribution than did the Director of the Administration Centrale des Postes.

It was a great layfolk's offering to the memory of the last of the Fathers, the inspirer of the *De Imitatione*, the precursor of the Schoolmen, in particular of St. Thomas.

The fitting conclusion was a pilgrimage to Fontaines-lès-Dijon, St. Bernard's early home. There was one matter for poignant regret, namely, the absence, owing to advanced age, of the venerable Abbé E. Vacandard, perhaps the greatest master of *Bernardina* that the world has known.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Irénikon.

The May number has an interesting article on Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs, by Mgr. F. Grivec, Professor of Theology at the University of Ljubiana, Jugo-Slavia, with which should be read the summary of the recent letter addressed by Pius XI. to the Bishops of Czecho-Slavia and Jugo-Slavia on the occasion of the eleventh centenary of St. Cyril and St. Methodius.

An article entitled "Prophecies?" by Dom A. de Lilienfeld, O.S.B., gives a graphic account of a book and an article by Professor Nicolas Berdjaen, which have made a sensation. The book is called *A New Middle Age*, and the article "Russian Religious Thought." "The religion of modern times," he writes, "has become a distinct part of culture, and ought to become a liberated spiritual force transfiguring all life. What will Russia choose? The undaunted Asiatic forces are waiting for the first moment of Western feebleness to establish their 'Satanocracy' at the expense of Christianity. The Russian religious idea is an idea of union of East with West in a single Christian world. Only the spiritual union of the Christianity of East and West can overcome the powerful alliance of anti-Christian forces."

The Chronicle includes a sympathetic account of the discussions in the Church Assembly on the Prayer Book; an account of the celebrations at York of the thirteenth centenary of the introduction of Christianity, by Anglicans and Roman Catholics; finally an account of a lecture by the Rev. Gage Brown at Louvain on Anglo-Catholicism.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. March, 1927.

The first article, on the proper object of spiritual theology, by A. Vallsin, S.J., is an admirable discussion of Asceticism and Mysticism and their respective places in sacred doctrine. This is followed by a learned article on Christian Penitence from the pen of E. Hocedez, S.J., and a Note on John xix. 11, by R. Thibaut, S.J. The April number is even more interesting, since it begins with an article by M. de la Taille, S.J., a reply to the critics of his book, *Mysterium Fidei*, on the union of the Supper and

of the Passion and the relation of each to the Sacrifice of the Mass. E. Schiltz, C.I.C.M., writes on the resurrection of the body in the light of reason; E. Gibbens, S.J., on the religious influence of Balmès, 1810-1848, Professor at Vich and at Barcelona, editor of three Reviews: *La Civilizacion*, *La Sociedad*, *El Pensamiento de la Nacion*. F. Peeters, S.J., reviews a new book on Islam, by H. Lammens, S.J., a most competent Orientalist, which should be read by all students of the subject.

A. E. B.

Zeitschrift für die N.T. Wissenschaft.

The first *Heft* of 1927 is less varied and interesting than usual.—E. Fascher leads off with an article on the place occupied by the Resurrection in the primitive preaching of the Gospel. Discussing 2 Cor. v., he sees there a view of the Resurrection which dispensed entirely with a resuscitation of the earthly body; the heavenly body prepared for the soul would take its place. The guarantee for the coming change was not the Resurrection of Jesus, but "the spirit" within (v. 5). Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski continue the controversy about the Mandæans, which has recently been treated in these columns. The Editor, Prof. Lietzmann, reaches the 14th of his studies on Creeds.

W. K. L. C.

Theologische Blätter. July.

Herr Otto Piper describes the World-Conference of the Churches on Faith and Order to be held at Lausanne August 3-21. It will discuss problems of doctrine and their application to Church order. The German Committee includes Professors Deissmann and Heiler, and younger theologians such as Professors Althaus, Frick, and K. L. Schmidt.

The subjects to be discussed are: 1. The call to unity. 2. The Gospel as the message of the Churches to the world. 3. The essence of the Church. 4. The common faith of the Church. 5. The office of the Church. 6. The sacraments. 7. The unity of Christendom and its relation to the existing Churches.

The subject-committee was not agreed as to the acceptance of the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed as a common confession of faith. But it was proposed to reintroduce the title and office of bishop, and to formulate a doctrine of the sacraments which should avoid both the *opus-operatum* theory and the reduction of the sacraments to a mere duplication of preaching.

L. P.

REVIEWS

PASTORAL THEOLOGY OF TODAY: "FEED MY SHEEP." Edited by Francis Underhill. Mowbray. 6s.

We have many valuable books on Pastoral Theology, chiefly dating back some thirty or forty years, but have become increasingly conscious of the need for new light upon the various methods called into existence by the rapidly changing world of today. With this end in view, Fr. Underhill and his collaborators have given us a valuable survey of the whole field.

The editor, in his opening essay on "The Priest of To-day," points out that the laity have a certain distrust of the priest while yet expecting from him an almost impossible standard of life, and in order to overcome the distrust and satisfy the demands, a higher standard of devotion in the clergy is required, and more discipline, ecclesiastical as well as personal. In his essay on "Preaching," Fr. Underhill finds the obligation of sermons in St. Paul's words: "Be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort." Every great religious movement has used preaching for the propagation of the faith, but of late an unhappy tendency has arisen of "depreciating the sermon in order to exalt the Mass," and many busy men seem to rely chiefly on the evening papers for their ideas about religion. "A revived method of preaching," which England so much needs, demands above all else that the preacher be himself a man of prayer, and that he find time for reading and study, so that he can come to the preparation of his sermons with the power of freshness and attraction. No amount of practical work, however important, can make up for the lack of these.

Dr. Selwyn deals with "Intellectual Problems" in a characteristic, incisive manner. On *teaching* he lays great stress, for it is even more important than preaching. The priest must be well educated, but must be wary of the danger of trying to know everything. Specialization is inevitable, indeed necessary. Due and proper rest must be provided: to forget this often leads to disaster.

Mr. Claxton makes a valuable contribution on "The Pastoral Training of Children," whose needs and capabilities he evidently understands thoroughly. He lays great stress on the paramount duty of parents in forming Catholic homes for their children. With such a background, sacramental life comes to them as something quite natural. Mr. Claxton deals well with the question of the Catechism, which, if well understood, gives backbone and attractiveness to the whole religious teaching.

We are glad that Canon Long, with his wide experience, writes on the subject of "Pastoral Visitation," taking as a pattern our Lord's example in dealing with individual souls, and showing that every priest is to be "an under shepherd of the Good Shepherd." It is difficult to understand how any priest, in view of his ordination vows, can question the importance of this part of his work. Great skill and knowledge are specially required for dealing with the sick, combined with very simple means, *e.g.*, the crucifix, and simple brief books of devotions. And who can tell the value of hours spent with a dying person? The religious principle of the Roman communion is surely both charitable and discreet, that any dying man can and ought to be absolved, absolutely or conditionally, unless he be altogether impenitent.

The subject of "Public Worship" Mr. Clayton treats as a fundamental matter; he could do no less. While realizing the decrease in the number of men who go to church, he rightly says: "On the whole, it would be true to say that attendance at church to-day means rather more than it used to mean." A regular church member is a marked man, and this fact carries with it a special responsibility which many feel unable to shoulder. Sunday work is also a great difficulty in many cases, and the finding an hour which will suit everyone. But the one thing certain is that Morning Prayer must not take the place of the Mass as the great central act of worship. The subject of parochial Missions needs to be gone into, and their value explained.

We badly need more English books on the subject of "Penance." Our debt to Rome is untold, for we have had to dig in Roman quarries for practically all we know in this connection, though books of our own are gradually emerging. Mr. Kirk's main point is that in Penance the priest finds himself in the relation of judge, acting as an agent of the community by absolving, admonishing, or withholding absolution when necessary. Through some such process it was that the leaders of the Oxford Movement recovered the practice of Confession.

The more spiritual side of Penance and "direction" is dealt with by Fr. Cary. Few amongst our priests have had more experience in this matter, or done more to face the question thereby raised on the question of vocation, and the restoration of the religious Life. Moreover, Fr. Cary is able to help us in the deeper ways of prayer and contemplation which may face the priest at any moment. We hope that his article may be read by many, for it supplies at a moment when it is likely to be much needed a reminder that careful, concentrated study is essential. Nor can we plead the absence of books to help us. If we have

not actually travelled in a mountainous country, it is something at least to have a map.

Canon Seaton writes on "The Holy Communion" in a paper full of insight and common sense, dealing with it from the pastoral point of view, "to feed and provide for the Lord's family" until they grow to the measure of the fulness of Christ. The priest must "teach the necessity of the sacred Food, to awaken and renew the desire for It," dealing with the necessary preparation and interpreting its meaning. With this must also go the study of the "Word," for the two are inseparable. Our teaching should go hand in hand with definite training in meditation and the devotional side of worship. He shows with excellent clearness how the whole work of the parish is centred at the altar, which "should be made the focus of the whole moral and spiritual life of Christian people, not as individuals merely, but as members of the Body of Christ."

Other papers are contributed by Preb. Stockley and Dr. Trollope, Bishop in Corea, discussing respectively "The Outsider" and "Foreign Missions."

Fr. Briscoe's concluding essay on "The Country Parish" is one of great charm, giving a picture full of reverence for the poor, recognizing them as heirs of a great heritage, loyal to their home, village, and priest, as well they may be when "the village priest is very happy in his flock." We happen to know that particular church, and the attractive power that issues from it and from the beautiful little village in the Quantocks.

These are but scrappy and disjointed remarks on a really good and valuable book, but if they serve the purpose of sending readers to the study of the book itself, we can assure them that they will not be disappointed.

W. B. TREVELYAN.

THE BOOK OF NUMBERS. With Introduction and Notes. By L. Elliott Binns, B.D. Westminster Commentaries. Methuen. 16s.

It is a welcome proof of the vitality of Old Testament studies that Mr. Binns has been able to add so much to what the late Dr. G. B. Gray gave us, twenty-three years ago, in his commentary on Numbers. The new light has come mainly from researches in folk-lore and comparative religion; of these Mr. Binns takes full advantage. He knows, also, how to use Babylonian material with good effect, and even ventures into the region of speculative philology; but play with Sumerian derivations is really outside the bounds, mere guess-work which only provokes disagreement. A wide knowledge of general

history enables him to illustrate the text in a way that is both fresh and suggestive (e.g. pp. 35, 87, 139, 151, 234); while his literary quotations are often most happy, as, for instance, in his notes on xi. 28, 29.

The Book of Numbers suffers from a lack of sustained interest for the reason that it possesses no literary or historical unity. To discover its higher value we have to look below the surface. It shows how the Hebrews slowly advanced towards a more spiritual conception of God, and, consequently, towards a purer moral code; God's method of training His people, God's purpose in controlling their history, can be traced with unmistakable distinctness. Mr. Binns justly remarks that the critics have restored the "true perspective" and thereby enhanced the religious value of the book. He weakens his point, however, by alluding to a "mystical interpretation" as the only way of extracting an edifying sense out of many of the narratives and laws. But why not frankly look at Numbers from the true perspective, instead of basing our religious use of it on dubious history and artificial exegesis?

At times we do not feel quite sure of Mr. Binns' position. He relies a great deal on Prof. Sayce's *Early History of the Hebrews*, and he quotes Mr. H. Wiener. The extract from Green's *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, given in the note on xix. 14, contradicts the position taken up elsewhere; and the same must be said, alas! of Keble's verse in connexion with xxiv. 2; from the critical point of view both are wholly misleading. A certain want of method, or of conviction, appears in the treatment of the Balaam story. Thus Dr. Daiches' explanation is referred to in a footnote on p. 150, as though it were of subordinate importance, whereas in the commentary (pp. 160, 167, 171) it is used to govern the interpretation. Perhaps, to get at the bottom of ch. xvi., an allusion might have been made to Lev. x. 1-7. Read in connexion, these passages betray, as Dr. Stanley Cook pointed out long ago, an attempt to push the claims of the later priesthood by adapting an old tradition: Korah and his fellow-rebels are burnt to death, the tribe of Levi is vindicated, and the priesthood established in the line of Aaron; but rivalries had sprung up among Aaron's descendants; accordingly his two elder "sons" are consumed by fire, and the priesthood is secured to the younger branches of the family! We miss on p. 96 a reference to the opinion of modern Egyptologists that *the sea of rushes* crossed by the fugitives must have been a piece of fresh water on the edge of the Mediterranean, where rushes could grow—the Serbonian lake, in fact; a view which relieves us of many difficulties about the route of the Exodus. There is more to be said on xxiv. 24

than Mr. Binns' note implies; Eber and Asshur are placed in parallelism, and both distinguished from the Israelites; it looks as if Eber (Gen. x. 21 ff.) = 'Ibrim = Habiru once stood for a larger group than the Israelites as we know them. These criticisms, however, do not detract from the solid merits of a valuable work.

G. A. COOKE.

NOTICES

ELEMENTARY CHRISTIANITY. By Cyril Alington, D.D. Longmans.
2s. 6d.

This is not a Lenten manual for the devout, but a defence of Christianity, addressed to the uninstructed; and deals mainly with the reasons for believing in the existence of God, and in the Godhead of Christ. It is brilliantly written, and especially interesting when Dr. Alington calls the poets to his aid; but it is not without serious omissions. Christian belief must begin with conviction of sin, but we find here hardly any mention of repentance or the need of salvation; and the Holy Spirit is only referred to incidentally. On the other hand, Dr. Alington's attacks on Church formularies would have been more appropriate in a book addressed to the clergy. He speaks of "the errors of the Athanasian Creed" without specifying them, and of the "heretical doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh" (in which context it is hard to attach any precise meaning to the word "heretical"), and he is very severe on the Articles: but what have these subjects to do with "elementary Christianity"? His repeated reference to our Lord as "the carpenter's Son," without any explanation, perhaps invites some misunderstanding; and he refers to the three-storeyed universe alleged to be assumed by the Creed, though, if I may use an *argumentum ad hominem*, it surely may be urged that to be "sent up" is not necessarily to be sent upstairs. Dr. Alington, however, writes for that most difficult class, the educated in every subject but religion, and he is one of the few who have their ear, and know how to establish contact with them. It is a great deal that the Head Master of Eton should set before his readers as their example the life of Bishop Edward King, on the ground that "he was prepared to take literally the Apostle's words about bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

C. B. MOSS.

THE TRUTH IN JESUS CHRIST. By Victor L. Whitechurch. Faith Press.
3s. 6d.

This is another book with the same object, to recommend the Faith to the uninstructed layman, but it is noticeable that Canon Whitechurch begins where Dr. Alington leaves off, with the reminder that Christianity is not only a system of belief or practice, but a life in a particular community. He sketches briefly the historical stages in the life of that community, using the Athanasian Creed without abusing it, and bringing each stage into relation to the life of the Church to-day. These two books,

both written by distinguished clerical novelists, provide a most interesting contrast between the methods and mentality of the schoolmaster and of the parish priest.

C. B. Moss.

PERSONALITY AND IMMORTALITY IN POST-KANTIAN THOUGHT. By E. G. Braham. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This work is described as "part of work submitted for degree of Doctorate in Philosophy at Liverpool University."

The style is at times somewhat careless, but the book shows evidence of wide reading, and of careful and sympathetic study of most of the important philosophical works of British origin which have appeared within the last two generations; also of nearly all the works of leading Continental philosophers which have appeared in translation during the same period.

Mr. Braham's thesis is well adapted to the purpose for which it was originally intended, but it is doubtful whether it will appeal very widely either to philosophers or to the ordinary reader. A large amount of space is devoted to expounding the views of philosophers whose works are well known to English readers—*e.g.*, Kant, Hegel, McTaggart, Bradley, Bosanquet, James, Lotze, and Ward. It would have been more profitable if these had been dealt with quite briefly, and space thus secured for the exposition of the systems of those philosophers whose chief works are not accessible in English.

Mr. Braham's criticisms are always fair, and are likely to carry conviction to most readers—they represent, in fact, for the most part average opinion upon the points criticized.

The most interesting part of the book is the constructive section (pp. 194-243), which is far too short to permit the writer to do justice to himself in the treatment of some of the most profound and difficult questions in the entire philosophy of religion.

CHARLES HARRIS.

DIE KIRCHE DES URCHRISTENTUMS (THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH).
By Karl Ludwig Schmidt. Published by J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen.
1927.

This pamphlet is a reprint from a collection of essays presented to Professor Adolf Deissmann on his sixtieth birthday (November 7, 1926).

It is divided into three parts: (1) *Ἐκκλησία* and its equivalents in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac; (2) the words of Jesus to St. Peter about the Church; (3) St. Paul and St. Peter: Gentile and Jewish Christianity, and Catholicism.

We do not intend to depreciate the value of Professor Schmidt's work by pointing out that a similar etymological investigation was pursued more than twenty years ago by Dr. Hort, in his first lecture on the Christian Ecclesia. Professor Schmidt goes further by adducing the Aramaic and Syriac equivalents of *Ἐκκλησία*.

Broadly speaking, *ἐκκλησία* of the LXX corresponds to the Hebrew *qahal*. Dr. Hort points out a distinction, namely, that in the first four

books of the Pentateuch *qahal* is translated by συναγωγή, but from Deuteronomy onwards by ἐκκλησία. Professor Schmidt admits that *qahal* is sometimes translated by συναγωγή, but on the whole ἐκκλησία = *qahal*, and συναγωγή = 'edah.

Both Dr. Hort and Professor Schmidt point out that ἐκκλησία may have been chosen by the LXX translators because of the similarity of sound to *qahal*. Dr. A. Cohen, of Birmingham, pointed out to the reviewer that a connection between the two words is possible, if the origin of language may be traced (as in Dr. Farrar's language) to onomatopœia. But there are other cases, which can hardly be regarded as more than paronomasia, as, for instance, the comparison drawn by the Rabbis between *shekhinah* and σκηνή, *torah* and θεωρία.

Anyhow ἐκκλησία was a more distinguished word, as Wellhausen says, than συναγωγή. In passing, we may refer to St. Augustine's quaint comment on Ps. lxxxii., that *convocatio* (ἐκκλησία) is a nobler word than *congregatio* (συναγωγή), because the former properly means a calling together of men, but the latter means a driving together of cattle. It may be doubted whether ἐκκλησία or ἐκκλητοί can be interpreted as those who are called from the world, but rather it means those who are called from their houses to the assembly.

It is, of course, impossible to determine exactly which Aramaic word was used by the early Christian Church. However, Professor Schmidt points out that 'edtā is not found in the Targūmim, but that the commonest word is *kenishtā*. The earliest Syriac version (Syr-Sin) has *kenushtā*. At the same time, *q'hala* may have been used. The *q'hala* emphasizes the claim of the Christian Church to be the people of God, the true Israel; the *kenishtā* suggests that it is a local and limited assembly. The result of this discussion of terms is that the particular separate congregation represents the universal congregation; the true *kenishtā* is the *q'hala*.

The saying in Matt. xvi. 18 may be considered under two headings: (1) the foundation of the Church; (2) the commission to St. Peter.

Professor Schmidt rejects Professor A. von Harnack's suggestion that "on this rock I will build my church" is an interpolation, and says that these words cannot be eradicated by processes of textual criticism. He would answer the question, whether Christ intended to found a church, in the affirmative, but adds that this fact must be related eschatologically to our Lord's Messianic consciousness and the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Again, Professor Schmidt asserts quite definitely that St. Peter received a special commission and promise from our Lord. He deals drastically with the common Protestant interpretations of the Rock as St. Peter's faith or Christ Himself. Luther's interpretation of the Rock as Christ sprang from his identification of St. Peter with the Pope.

Thirdly, we must consider the relation between St. Peter and St. Paul, as representing Jewish and Gentile Christianity. Though St. Paul reproved St. Peter at Antioch, he still regarded him as one raised above the mass of believers. St. Peter and St. Paul had, in the main, the same conception of the Church. If the Church as the people of God is more than an assembly of individual men, then as the body of Christ it is a mystical unity, which is pervaded by Christ, who is the Spirit. Every particular church represents the universal Church.

Professor Schmidt concludes with a reference to the development of

Church government in relation to Catholicism. It is clear that there were more πνευματικοί (spiritual men) at the beginning, but it was not their retirement in favour of the presbyters and bishops that created the divergence to Catholicism, but the hierarchical emphasis laid on presbyters and bishops. Catholicism appeals to St. Peter and the primitive Church grouped around Peter. Protestantism has no right to take from St. Peter what is due to him, but it has the right and duty to keep alive the protest of St. Paul against St. Peter and the early Church, so that the Church may be represented as the people of God and not as a hierarchy of men.

Professor Schmidt has treated his subject in an original and independent manner, and has indicated lines for further investigation.

L. PATTERSON.

THE NARRATIVES OF THE RESURRECTION. By P. Gardner-Smith, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge. Methuen. 1926. 6s. net.

Mr. Gardner-Smith's painstaking and detailed examination of the documentary evidences for our Lord's resurrection affords a striking example of the stubborn resistance which the Gospels offer to all attempts to scale them down to the doctrinal standards of Liberal Protestantism. For if it is really the case, one would say, that the miraculous element in Christian origins can only be disproved by such a treatment of historical sources as is to be found here, then the presumption is that that element is indeed part of the truth. Such, at least, is the somewhat paradoxical impression which Mr. Gardner-Smith's book makes upon myself.

Mr. Gardner-Smith is convinced that we have to do in these narratives with the growth of a tradition by a process of legendary accretion. The seed from which all grew was simple enough. Early on the third day a party of the women made their way to the sepulchre to anoint the body of Jesus. They reached a tomb which was open, and met there a young man who, when he realized the purpose of their errand, told them that they had come to the wrong tomb and directed them to the right one. Too frightened, however, to follow his directions, they fled and told no one what had happened. Meanwhile, the disciples had already fled into Galilee; and it was there that belief in the Lord's resurrection originated as a result of His appearing to them. It is possible that these appearances in Galilee were followed later by appearances in Jerusalem; but faith in the continued survival of Jesus after death was first established in Galilee; and that is all that Christianity needed then or needs now as the basis of its Easter faith.

Needless to say, it is only by a very drastic treatment of the documents that such a reconstruction of the facts can be achieved. Thus, no attention is paid to the structure of the verses in 1 Cor. xv., where St. Paul gives the gist of the Apostolic faith as to Christ's death, burial, resurrection, and appearances; nor is his teaching as to resurrection in general made the subject of any thorough examination. St. Luke is admitted to be using an independent source in his narrative of the resurrection; but no weight is attached to the unrivalled opportunities which his stay at Cæsarea with St. Paul gave him for procuring first-hand information as to what occurred. St. Mark is our earliest and most reliable witness; but even he represents a stage of the tradition already far advanced in accretion. In Mark xvi. 7, 8, for example, the word ἡγέρθη (he is risen)

in the young man's utterance at the tomb, and the message which the women are bidden to deliver to "his disciples and to Peter," are not historical. Important evidence, on the other hand, is to be gleaned from "The Gospel of Peter," which, though commonly called apocryphal, is really an independent authority, and contains some primitive features which have been overlaid in all the canonical Gospels.* Finally, some of Mr. Gardner-Smith's arguments seem so far-fetched as to be almost perverse. The description, for instance, of Matthew's statement that the women came to gaze upon the tomb as "a somewhat feeble explanation" could surely only be written by one who had never kept his eyes open in a churchyard; the assertion that "no writer is more frankly materialistic than John in his account of the resurrection," argues the crudest philosophy of spirit and matter; while we know of nothing but an overdose of "criticism" which could have led to the logic of the following passage: "More difficult to explain are the resemblances between this narrative [Lk. xxiv. 36-49] and Matthew xxviii. 16-20. Here place and time are different, and the only points of resemblance are the doubt of the disciples and the commission given to them. The latter point is important, because it creates a strong probability that, despite all differences, the two accounts are really descriptions of the same event." We wonder whether there is any other branch of history in which argument of that kind would be advanced.

None the less, it must not be supposed that Mr. Gardner-Smith's book is without value. The historical problems presented by the discrepancies in the narratives of the resurrection are real and serious; and they will be found set forth here in meticulous detail. The arrangement of the material, moreover, is clear, and nothing is shirked. Those who cannot accept the author's conclusions will yet find themselves provoked to give reasons to themselves for rejecting them; and that process of enquiry alone should lead to a truer appreciation of the great miracle of which these records treat. It is probably that appreciation which Mr. Gardner-Smith most desires to be the fruit of his work; and he is therefore likely to be rewarded even in the case of those who most strongly dispute his conclusions.

E. G. SELWYN.

THE JEW AND CHRISTIANITY. By H. Danby, D.D. Sheldon Press. 3s. 6d.

Christianity began as a sect of Judaism: it was the success of St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles that made it an independent religion. When the Church began to acknowledge that the Law of Moses was not binding on Christians generally, then R. Tarphon (Tryphon) declared that Christianity was more deadly than paganism.

In Talmudic times (roughly A.D. 150-600) the Empire was regarded by the Jews chiefly as a Persecutor, and the first Christian emperor in particular imposed severe restrictions on them. The synods of the Church—

* Mr. Gardner-Smith followed up his claims on behalf of "The Gospel of Peter" by two articles in the *J.T.S.* last year; but he does not seem to have seriously shaken the conclusions of earlier students of that fragment, such as Swete and James. Note, for example, that in v. 59, "Peter" writes ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί in the resurrection story, in a connexion where Matthew rightly has οἱ ἐνδεκα μαθηταί. The inference is that "Peter" lived later than Matthew, when the concrete situation had been forgotten, and "the twelve" was a fixed expression, equivalent to "the apostles."

e.g., in Visigothic Spain—passed canons forbidding the characteristic practices of Judaism, notably Circumcision. In this period, in retaliation, scandalous accounts of Jesus were composed among the Jews. They impute dishonour to Him in His birth, but show very little knowledge of the facts of His life. The Crusades, the Black Death, and the Renaissance each brought evil upon the Jews. The Crusaders slew the Jew in Europe on their way to slay the Saracen in Palestine. The Jews were accused of causing the Great Pestilence, and were massacred as though proved guilty. In the sixteenth century the Talmud was discovered by the Church, and was supposed to be full of attacks on Christianity. Sometimes it was burnt, sometimes by milder judgment passages were struck out by a Christian censor before it could be printed.

Such are the facts set forth in Dr. Danby's book. It is a "popular" book in the good sense; the writer is competent for a task which requires wide knowledge and unbiassed judgment. The moral is that Christian harshness has been the chief cause of Jewish prejudice. At the present time the nature of Judæo-Christian controversy has changed; the Jewish scholar respects Jesus, but maintains that His characteristic teaching was derived from Judaism. Dr. Danby's account of the present situation is very interesting. His book has a moral for these times, and should be read.

W. EMERY BARNES.

THE LIFE OF BISHOP WILFRID BY EDDIUS STEPHANUS. Text, translation, and notes. By B. Colgrave. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Colgrave has done a great service in publishing a fresh edition of the text of Eddius Stephanus's Life of St. Wilfrid. The last two editions, Levison's in the *Monumenta Germanicæ Historiæ*, and Ranie's in the Rolls Series, are accessible to none but students, and Ranie's text is not accurate. Mr. Colgrave modestly describes his own translation as "unpretentious," but he has had much expert help, and his book will certainly be of great assistance to those who, anxious to study the history of the seventh century from the original documents, have been hindered by the difficulties of Eddius's crabbed style. This book is interesting, too, in other ways. With the exception of the anonymous Life of St. Cuthbert, and Bede's metrical life of the same saint, it is the earliest piece of biography we possess, and, as a matter of fact, the earliest considerable piece of literature written in this country. Though the actual evidence that he wrote it is not strong, the work has always been attributed to Eddius Stephanus. Eddius came north from Kent with Wilfrid in 669, when he was about twenty years of age; from that time forward he seems to have been in constant touch with his master, and to have accompanied Wilfrid in his various wanderings, exiles, and journeys to Rome; at the time of Wilfrid's death he had been in daily intercourse with him for forty years. After Wilfrid's death, at Oundle, Eddius appears to have lived as a monk at Ripon; it was probably at Ripon that he wrote the Life, prompted thereto by the anonymous Life of St. Cuthbert. Eddius's work has been much criticized—he was a partisan; he was credulous; he made mistakes as to historical fact. "But," says Mr. Colgrave, "in spite of all this, the Life presents a living picture of St. Wilfrid such as we certainly do not get in Bede [and] apart from all questions of the credibility of Eddius as a historian, the value of the biography is to be found in the account given of the building and renovation of the Churches of York, Ripon, and

Hexham, the glimpse we get of the significance of Wilfrid in the history of the times, and an extremely interesting picture of life in England and on the continent in the late seventh century." In the matter of introduction, references, and notes, this book is a model of what such a work should be, and Mr. Colgrave is to be much congratulated on his achievement.

J. S. FLETCHER.

VISIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL WORLD. By Sadhu Sundar Singh. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.

The question of visions is of perennial psychological interest. That the spiritual world is more real than the world of the five senses most readers of THEOLOGY would agree. The proposition that the trance state, induced by prayer, is a state of close contact with the spiritual world, would command the assent of those who accept the first proposition. The question at issue is how far the visions are objective and how far subjective. Presumably they are largely shaped and coloured by the mind of the seer. But this does not invalidate their reality. All the mystics indicate that their descriptions are, in some sort, translations of the things seen.

The Western mind, with its love of logic and its scientific usage of reasoning, is impatient of vision literature. Here is the Eastern mind, corrective of an over-emphasized Westernism. Sundar Singh speaks of conversations, which take place while he is in a state of ecstasy, between himself and angels and departed spirits, as being as normal and ordinary as theological discussions between fellow-believers on earth. He does not argue or seek to prove. He states. He is as sure as any spiritualist of his contact with departed spirits. But all the paraphernalia of the medium and the séance are absent; and, one may add, all the conspicuous triviality of most spirit communications. He records grave utterances about the state of the departed. Paradise, heaven and hell are presented, not as rewards and punishments, but as the outcome of the unconscious choice of the individual soul, resultant from the personal character and outlook developed in the life on earth.

Apocalypse needs careful scrutiny. Much of the Jewish apocalyptic literature has deservedly fallen into desuetude. Perhaps this is because it was the product of a time of repression and constraint. Sundar Singh writes with breadth and serenity.

H. LOVELL CLARKE.

THE PERMANENT VALUE OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. By H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D. George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

There is much that is valuable in this study. It is fresh, scholarly, and to the point. If it is sometimes rhetorical, that can be forgiven in a book which originated in the pulpit. But the most interesting thing about it is the revelation which it gives of the theological gulf between orthodoxy, as the Catholic Church understands it, and modern Protestantism, even of a fairly conservative kind. The chapter on the Second Commandment is illuminating, and if anyone wants a defence of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, he will find it here. For the real meaning of Mr. Flowers's dislike of the *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις* of images comes out on p. 69. "The thought shared by more people than we are apt sometimes to imagine . . . that while Jesus was a babe at His mother's breast, He was also God over all

the earth, is as revolting to our intellect as it is against the plain teaching of Scripture." This very gentle Iconoclast turns out to be an extreme Nestorian, and finds it necessary to warn his readers that more people than they would imagine believe in the Theotokos!

K. D. MAUCKENZIE.

TRACTATE SHABBATH, MISHNAH. Translated from the Hebrew with explanatory notes by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The *Mishnah Tractate Shabbath* stands at the head of twelve tractates, which together form the second of the six sections into which the Mishnah is divided, and which treats of festive seasons.

Dr. Oesterley's translation is both readable and carefully done, and the notes are adequate. The Introduction, which is lucid and short, deals with the place of the Tractate in the Mishnah; its main purposes; the characteristic subjects dealt with therein; its literary character and style; and its bearing on the teaching of the New Testament; ending up with a synopsis of the contents of the Tractate.

Reference to the pre-Mishnic halakic Midrashim (Mechilta, Sifre, Sifra) as well as to Philo and Josephus is missing. (In the section on the Sabbath lamp Dr. Oesterley might have brought in the interesting allusion of Seneca, Ep. 98.) It is to be regretted that the Tosefta was not included. Moreover, in order to understand the halakic Shabbath regulations properly, it is necessary also to take into account the second Tractate in this section—Erubin. And yet, to judge from the S.P.C.K. advertisement, Shabbath is to be the last of the series of translations! Although it was not intended to give a complete list of references to former translations of this Tractate, yet much more might have been included even within the limits the translator set himself, for instance: *Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna*, translated by D. A. de Sola and M. T. Raphall (London, 1843), and Joseph Barclay, *The Talmud*, a translation of eighteen Treatises from the Mishna, with notes and appendix (London, 1878).

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

THE LIFE OF THOMAS CRANMER. By A. C. Deane.

THE LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY. By W. H. Hutton, Dean of Winchester.
Great English Churchmen Series. Macmillan. 6s. each.

Certainly the most pleasant way of studying history is to read good biographies; and when they are so very good as these two volumes of Mr. Sidney Dark's series of Great English Churchmen, the ordinary reader feels that history has come to life indeed. Both books leave a deep and clear-cut impression on the mind.

Canon Deane's vivid study of Cranmer is from this point of view of extraordinary value. On the one hand, the character and mind of Cranmer himself were essentially plastic; on the other, his unique sense of literary form makes his written word an exact replica of his mind. He is thus an incomparable medium for recording the influences brought to bear on him.

Cranmer's life, excluding his boyhood, falls into two equal halves, but his biographer finds little to record in the former of them. Happy in having no history were his years as undergraduate, "coach," fellow, and lecturer in divinity; though Canon Deane somewhat quaintly suggests

that his forced marriage with a barmaid, who died within the year, enabled him to sympathize in later years with a royal master who also had a wife whom he would not have chosen! Perhaps the suggestion that his spirit was broken by a bullying schoolmaster is nearer the mark when it comes to accounting for the perpetual cringe which marks his public life. Apart from the sordid story of "Black Joan," and the temporary loss of his fellowship which she entailed, Cranmer's twenty-six years at Cambridge were a time of quiet academic success. But suddenly, accidentally as it might seem, "from this quiet work where his abilities found full scope, he was forced to a conspicuous position for which he was strangely unfit." His suggestion that the King's conscience in the matter of his marriage might be salved by archiepiscopal decree was thrown out in all donnish innocence: it was to have the surprising result of making him the archbishop who should cut the knot. "A man at once ingenuous enough to believe in the royal conscience and ingenious enough to further the royal aims was indeed one to be welcomed." Canon Deane believes that the King resolved at once that Cranmer should be Warham's successor, though Cranmer's own guileless lack of ambition is shown by his choosing this as a suitable moment for taking a second wife, at that date an embarrassing addition to the household of a great ecclesiastic.

The King had his way, and Cranmer signalized the beginning of his primacy by taking the customary oath of allegiance to the Pope, while at the same time he made a declaration before a notary that he would not consider it binding if its fulfilment should conflict with the wishes of the King. The rest of the miserable story is all too consistent with its inauguration. "Few good men have done so many bad things. Perhaps the English Church has never had an archbishop at once so amiable and so incompetent." That is perhaps the kindest thing the biographer could say about him. Perfectly incapable of holding his own against the tyranny of Henry, he sought and, to some extent, found peace of mind in the theory that the King could do no wrong, and that the duty of an archbishop was to be his executive officer. With this conviction he could steel himself to connive at every infamy, and allow the Church to be robbed and insulted without a word of protest. So it is to the end: the line of least resistance all the way; until at last a flash of nobility illuminates the final moments.

Canon Deane tells the story as the tragedy that it is, sympathetically but ruthlessly. In his own words, "the annals of our Church hold few more interesting and none more pathetic."

The Dean of Winchester's picture of John Wesley, if less stereoscopic, is no less brilliant. It has perhaps more atmosphere, is more the work of an historian and less of a biographer. And, of course, Wesley touches the religious life of our own day at many points, while Cranmer's influence, intense as it is, is now only exercised through the magic of the Book of Common Prayer. "Wesley," says the Dean, "transformed the religion of a race which is spreading . . . over the whole world." The words are not too strong. Everyone who has had any pastoral experience knows that the religious life of England is deeply imbued with a certain colour which is not that of the Prayer Book, nor the Bible, nor Catholic tradition, nor the Reformation. It is subtle, but unmistakable. Every mission preacher subconsciously appeals to it; every parish priest is trying to justify himself to it. Reverent, individualist, homely, personal, care-

less of ecclesiastical order, convinced of the Divine love and justice, thoroughly sentimental, untheological, what is this unique state of mind which is the standard Christianity of England? The answer seems to be: This is authentic Wesleyanism.

It need not be said that the Dean has drawn a picture which illuminates the life of the great evangelist and much besides. Wesley was too great a man to be explained by his environment, but some knowledge of the context is necessary if we are to understand the text. So this short biography gives us a sketch, not only of John Wesley, but of his parents, his native county and village, of the religious life of Oxford in the seventeenth century, of the Moravian brotherhood, and of the typical eighteenth-century bishop. Through such an atmosphere the great preacher and lover of souls flashes like a comet. Undisciplined, narrow-minded, self-opinionated, autocratic, he has many vulnerable points; but we are never allowed to forget his true greatness, nor his astonishing influence. The Dean believes that "the fact that men's thoughts in England were turned to the things of God and the soul preserved the country from any share in the foreign revolutions," "English life became more honest, more philanthropic, more pure," as the result of Wesley's preaching. "It was Wesley's influence which made men feel that the things of the soul were paramount."

The book is one which may be read with much profit and even more pleasure.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM. By G. H. Box, D.D. With THE TESTAMENTS OF ISAAC AND JACOB. By S. Gaselee, M.A. Pp. xxxii+92. S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

He who would fully understand the beginnings of Christianity must make himself familiar, as far as possible, with the atmosphere in which it came into being. We have long known what the ancient Greek world was like, but it is only in comparatively recent years that we have begun to form an estimate of the Jewish background of the Gospels and of the early chapters of the Acts. For this we must turn neither to Josephus nor to Philo, but to the Rabbinic and Apocalyptic literature which expressed the point of view held by the cultured Pharisee and by the popular mind.

Not the least of the many services Canon Box has rendered to the cause of biblical study is the steady stream of editions in English of important works illuminating the Jewish mind, and we welcome another, as important and as well edited as any of its predecessors. There is an introduction which explains the position taken by the Testament of Abraham, and suggests points on which it illustrates ideas, particularly of death and of the hereafter, with which we are familiar, though we can find but vague allusion to them in Scripture. The translation is what we should expect from Dr. Box, and there are references to larger works which will be valuable to the student who wishes to enter more deeply into the matter.

The Testament of Abraham is Jewish; the Testaments of Isaac and Jacob are Christian, and form an admirable appendix to the longer work. Competent Coptic scholars are rare, and we are the more indebted to Mr. Gaselee for these two booklets, which serve to illustrate the way in which the early Church accepted and absorbed its Jewish heritage.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Messrs. LONGMANS & CO.'S LIST

THE WORLD TOUR OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON SOME WORLD PROBLEMS

BY THE RIGHT REV.

A. F. WINNINGTON INGRAM, D.D., K.C.V.O.

LORD BISHOP OF LONDON

With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. net.

"As an appeal to endure hardness and welcome adventure for the sake of Kith and Kin, and for the glory of God, it speaks with compelling force."—*The Guardian*.

THE PRAYER BOOK REVISED

An introduction to the book referred to in the Prayer Book Measure, and approved by the Convocations on March 29, 1927, for submission to the Church Assembly and to Parliament. By the Rev. FRANK THEODORE WOODS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester. Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 3s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

THE IDEAS OF THE FALL AND OF ORIGINAL SIN

A Historical and Critical Study. The Bampton Lectures for 1924

By the Rev. N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 8vo. 21s. net.

"The most valuable contribution to doctrinal and historical theology made for many years. . . . It must be read, and no teacher of theology will be excusable who fails to read it."—Dr. H. L. GOUDGE in *The Church Times*.

CONSCIENCE AND ITS PROBLEMS. An Introduction to Casuistry.

By the Rev. KENNETH E. KIRK, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo. 16s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD., 39, Paternoster Row, LONDON, E.C.4

*An Appeal to those of the
English Church who love
Our Lord and the Catholic
Religion, and will seek Him
in His Children*

THE HOLY FAMILY HOMES

Little Families—NOT Institutions
—of youngsters from poor homes,
no homes, or otherwise destitute—
with LOVE to guide and guard
them, and the Faith to sustain them

Literature and all particulars from the Secretary and Treasurer, Rev. G. H. Burnett,
Holy Family Homes, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1

S. P. C. K.

A Selection of Books from the S.P.C.K. Autumn List.

CONFIRMATION, OR THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.

Volume II. Practical. By various authors. Cloth boards. 8s. 6d. net.

- I. A GENERAL SURVEY.** By O. HARDMAN, M.A., D.D.
- II. ADOLESCENCE AND SEX INSTRUCTION.** By REGINALD TRIBE, S.S.M.
- III. PREPARATION IN THE PARISH (1).** By J. F. LOVEL SOUTHAM, M.A.
- IV. PREPARATION IN THE PARISH (2).** By E. GROSE HODGE, M.A.
- V. PREPARATION IN THE PARISH (3).** By HAROLD ELLIS, B.A.
- VI. PREPARATION IN THE SCHOOL (1).** By W. W. VAUGHAN, M.V.O., M.A., Headmaster of Rugby School.
- VII. PREPARATION IN THE SCHOOL (2).** By ARTHUR CHILTON, D.D., Headmaster of the City of London School.
- VIII. PREPARATION IN THE SCHOOL (3).** By F. R. GRAY, M.A., J.P., formerly High Mistress of St. Paul's Girls' School.
- IX. THE CONFIRMATION SERVICE.** By BISHOP S. M. TAYLOR, M.A., D.D.
- X. THE AFTER CARE OF CANDIDATES (1).** By H. LOVELL CLARKE, M.A.
- XI. THE AFTER CARE OF CANDIDATES (2).** By R. C. JOYNT, M.A., Archdeacon of Kingston-on-Thames.
- XII. THE AFTER CARE OF CANDIDATES (3).** By W. P. T. ATKINSON, M.A.

THE GLORY OF GOD in the Incarnation of the Word.

By W. H. G. HOLMES, M.A. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

[FATHER HOLMES' earlier book, "The Presence of God," has been widely read. The present one shows the same characteristics—all the freshness and originality. Special attention is paid to the exact meaning of Incarnation as contrasted with Indian "Avatars."]

A BONDMAN OF THE LORD.

The Life and Letters of St. Paul. By H. S. C. E. With several illustrations. Cloth boards. 4s. 6d. Cheap Edition, limp cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

[A really simple life of St. Paul.]

TEXTUAL DISCOVERIES IN PROVERBS, PSALMS, AND ISAIAH.

By MELVILLE SCOTT, D.D. Cloth boards. 8s. 6d. net.

STUDIES IN ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX.

By the Rev. WATKIN W. WILLIAMS, M.A. With several illustrations. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

[The author gives the results of recent research.]

THE SON OF ZEBEDEE

And the Fourth Gospel. By the Rev. H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. With a Preface by the Rt. Rev. W. TEMPLE, D.D., Bishop of Manchester. Duxeen boards. 5s. net.

[The BISHOP OF MANCHESTER writes: "... impressive study of a most important subject. MR. NUNN is a scholar well qualified to help us in clearing our minds about a matter on which I find myself convinced that prejudice has obscured the judgment of even great authorities."]

THE FOUR GOSPELS

Their Literary History and their Special Characteristics. By the Rev. MAURICE JONES, D.D. Second Edition. Cloth boards. 4s. 6d. net.

[This very useful book appears in a second edition, with an Introduction summarising the results of the last six years' study of the problem.]

THE WISDOM OF EGYPT AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the light of the newly discovered "Teaching of Amen-em-Ope." By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

S. P. C. K.

*A Selection of Books from the S.P.C.K. Autumn List.
(Continued from previous page.)*

THE HISTORIC MONUMENTS OF ENGLAND.

Edited by PROFESSOR A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A.

THE PAINTED GLASS OF YORK.

An Account of the Mediæval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches. By the Rev. F. HARRISON, M.A., F.S.A., Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York. With a Preface by the Very Rev. W. FOXLEY NORRIS, D.D., Dean of Westminster. With four coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

ENGLISH MONUMENTAL SCULPTURE SINCE THE RENAISSANCE. By KATHARINE A. ESDAILE. With many illustrations. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

[The lovely relics of mediævalism are appreciated by all educated people. The sculpture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, on the other hand, has been neglected, and, in some cases, removed from our churches. It has been left to MRS. ESDAILE, with a wealth of specialist knowledge, to point out the value of the artistic heritage preserved in these monuments.]

PAPERS AND DIARIES OF A YORK FAMILY, 1764-1839.

By Mrs. EDWIN GRAY. With twelve illustrations. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

YORK MINSTER HISTORICAL TRACTS.

By Various Authors. Volume 12s. 6d. net.

The Tracts are obtainable separately, twenty-eight in number, 3d. each.

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES AND THEIR RESULTS.

An Essay in Psychology and Comparative Religion. By ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

[A very original book with an appeal to thinkers of all religions.]

ST. HUGH OF LINCOLN.

By REGINALD MAXWELL WOOLLEY, D.D. With several illustrations. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

RESCUE WORK.

Written for the Church Penitentiary Association by one of its Council, EDWARD C. TRENHOLME, S.S.J.E. With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. Paper boards. 2s. 6d. net.

MY FAITH.

By VERNON F. STORR, Canon of Westminster. Paper cover. 1s. Cloth. 2s. net.

[Prepared to meet the widely felt need of a popular manual of faith and practice for general use in parishes where the teaching is on Liberal Evangelical lines.]

THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

Prayers for Holy Seasons and other Anniversaries. Compiled by ARTHUR MCCHEANE, M.A. With a Preface by H. V. S. ECK, D.D. (Manuals of the Inner Life.) Paper cover. 1s. Cloth boards. 2s. net.

BUDDHISM AND BUDDHISTS IN JAPAN.

By ROBERT CORNELL ARMSTRONG, M.A., Ph.D. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

[An expert's description of contemporary Japanese religion.]

A PILGRIM'S VISIT TO THE LAND OF JESUS.

By S. M. ELLIOT. With many illustrations. Paper boards. 2s. 6d. net.

EARLY CHRISTIANS OF ROME.

Their words and pictures. By G. M. BEVAN. With numerous illustrations. Paper covers. 2s. 6d. Cloth boards. 4s. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

Early next year it will publish a One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be assailed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership : Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows : Full Members, 10/- a year ; Associates, 2/6 ; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.